The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

FIVE months' absence from the editorial chair and a return just before press day cannot be recommended as a preparation for writing editorial notes, especially when they are expected to contain topical comment. About one thing, however, there can be no doubt—our gratitude to those who attended to the affairs of this journal last quarter. To Dr. W. B. Selbie, whose indomitable spirit triumphs over the weaknesses of the flesh, and whose lucidity of mind is undisturbed by the years, we are especially grateful for his oversight, and we are also in debt for varied service to the Rev. Geoffrey F. Nuttall, Miss Margaret Peel, and Mr. C. B. Webb, Manager of Independent Press, and his secretary, Miss Twamley.

During these five months much has happened internationally and denominationally. Pearl Harbour solved President Roosevelt's main problem and united the American people, but so far the war in the Pacific has been a series of disasters. The losses to the American and British fleets gave the Japanese the control of the sea, and all the splendid heroism shown in many of the Eastern theatres of war, unsupported by air power, was insufficient to stem the onward rush of the Nipponese. Burma has gone the way of Hong Kong, Singapore, and Java, and the consequences to the Chinese, who have made a magnificent fight under their Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, may be serious indeed. The war is resolving itself into a fight for time. Can the Axis powers obtain and maintain a strangle-hold on the Allied lines of communication —the shipping losses continue to be disquieting—or can the United Nations obtain sufficient air superiority to crush Germany before she can replenish her oil and other dwindling essentials of war? There are hopeful accounts of the effects of the British blockade, and the sight of American war production, with its growing momentum, is impressive. At the moment the need is ships—and still more ships. If the British and American navies prove as successful along the East Coast of the United States and on the life-line to North Russia as they have been in the trans-Atlantic convoys the end will be in sight.

* * *

WE have frequently emphasized the tremendous task before mankind when the democracies have gained their victory—that of eradicating from the minds of a generation of young people in the

totalitarian States the ideas in which they have been trained. The nature of that task will be realized afresh by readers of Mr. Gregor Ziemer's *Education for Death* (Constable, 7s. 6d.), a book as terrible in its way as Valtin's *Out of the Night*. Mr. Ziemer, who was President of the American Colony School in Berlin, obtained permission from Herr Rust, the Minister for Education, to visit educational institutions and study Nazi methods of training. This book is his report, written from notes made at the time. His inspection was thorough, for he saw women—physically and mentally weak and politically unsound—being sterilized, and hospitals where mentally defective children were "put to sleep". He visited Maternity Homes where girls were encouraged, in marriage or out of it, to bear children for the Führer, and went round with the Matrons to see that the State (illegitimate) children were trained in Nazi doctrine until they were six. He visited young married people, determined to have four children for the Führer as quickly as possible, so that they need not repay the money loaned by the Nazis to young healthy Aryans on marriage. He shows how boys and girls under ten are taught to worship the Führer, to despise the democracies, and to consider dying for the Führer or bearing children to die for him the one aim of life. He visited the various Youth organizations, and reveals how every phase of life is controlled and standardized. We learn how history and geography are taught, regardless of truth, but with the object of making all who learn fanatical in their devotion to the German State. The textbooks used are quoted and actual lessons described—lessons in hate and cruelty.

Here are some figures about the Hitler Youth:

> The Hitler Jugend marines had an annual enrolment of 78,000.
>
> The H.J. flyers had enough gliders and planes provided . . . to teach 135,000 boys to fly each year.
>
> The motorized units of the H.J. enrolled 295,000 boys each year. The Party provided them with 5,000 motor cycles annually, and with 1,300 repair shops.

And here is Mr. Ziemer's summary, the challenge resulting from the ominous facts of his survey:

> There are various attitudes we can adopt toward the Nazi school. We can doubt its existence. We can doubt its efficacy. We can wishfully hope that if it does exist, and if it really is efficient, then somehow, somewhere, something will stop it. We can thank God that we are not like other men. Or we can be realistic, take another critical look at Hitler's schools, and admit frankly that Hitler's educational system, which has set itself the task of sweeping Democracy from the

face of the earth, is an even greater menace than his army or his Luftwaffe. If and when his present fighting force is beaten, then behind the military array we will [*sic*] perceive a younger army, even more fanatic than the soldiery of now; and this army too must be vanquished before Hitlerism will be destroyed. To permit it to exist, to ignore it, or adopt half-way measures toward it would be a blunder inviting a third calamity like those of 1914 and 1939.

Which will be the harder task, winning this war, or preventing the next?

* * *

And if, incessantly and systematically, the Nazis make sure of youth, even so do they spread their tentacles in other lands. In *No Other Road to Freedom* (Faber, 12s. 6d.) Mr. Leland Stowe, the American war correspondent, shows how, once they had subdued Britain, the Germans could gain control of the United States without fighting at all. He estimates that in the autumn of 1940 90 per cent of Rumanians and Bulgarians, 85 per cent of Yugoslavs, and 70 per cent of Hungarians, were anti-Nazi, and yet by obtaining the aid of two or three per cent of men in key-positions the Nazis secured control. His vivid chapters on the "Trojan horse" in Norway drive home the same lesson.

The thoroughness with which the Nazi scheme was carried through may be illustrated by two quotations:

> I never saw a single Nazi officer take a drink in that bar. These Germans were not like Englishmen and Frenchmen (and Americans), who always took their wars with whiskies or brandies. These Germans, whether in uniform or in supposedly civilian activities, were all too busy for any kind of alcoholic festivities. You don't conquer Europe with hangovers. For them this war was a brutally severe business. They had not come to Rumania to celebrate, but to do a highly important job.
>
> By all these methods the 'New Order' insinuated and entrenched itself in every Balkan country. Hitler's advance agents might dress and talk like businessmen or financial advisers, but they worked with greater energy and intelligent direction than any other group of men I have ever seen. They exploited fears and racial and national hatreds. They appealed to greed and social and political ambitions. They promised and gave rich rewards for services rendered. They utilized propaganda with an almost diabolical skill and they knew the weaknesses of every mentality which they approached. Whatever their object, they were undeterred by any scruple of decency or honesty. If conversion would not work, they were equally expert at contamination and corruption. Nothing mattered except the complete triumph of

> the Nazi revolution and the stupendous prizes in riches and power which would be won by all the élite of the new 'master race'. Hitler had shown exactly how it could be done—through ruthlessness and treachery and terrorism and well-calculated dissemination of fear. The Nazi 'salesmen' understood all this thoroughly. For revolution to succeed you must spread moral and social disintegration. The first and most essential conquest must be achieved on the inside.

Are the democracies working with the same energy and efficiency? Mr. Stowe's aim is to make his own people realize their danger, and to stimulate them to plan and work with Nazi thoroughness. He does this in part by a searching analysis of Mr. Lindbergh's speeches and in part by an appalling picture of British stupidity and lack of preparedness, for which, to quote one of his examples, our troops in Norway, unsupported from the air, had to pay:

> During the first forty-eight hours after the small German garrison occupied Oslo it was incomprehensible that British planes were not sent to explore the strength of the Germans and to bomb Fornebu airport. A German colonel later told Edmund Stevens: 'What we feared most was a lightning reprisal by the British. If they had struck then, our whole expedition would have ended in disaster'. He added, with a smile: 'Fortunately, one can always count upon the British to arrive too late'. But throughout those first forty-eight hours, while British bombing was concentrated on Stavanger on the coast, even fifty or sixty R.A.F. bombers could have completely isolated the few Germans who had managed to land at Fornebu. On the third day British bombers could have intercepted and destroyed the seven troop ships, with their cargo of twenty thousand men, as they crept up Oslo fjord. But for some incomprehensible reason the British did not bomb Fornebu until almost two weeks later, and then the B.B.C. announced it quite proudly—blissfully overlooking the fact that Fornebu had been an absolutely essential target from the first day of the invasion.

* * *

THE longer the war lasts the clearer it grows that of nations, as men, it is true that what they sow they also reap, and that it can never be right for them to do wrong, especially if in so doing they save their own skins. Britain failed to resist aggression in Manchuria and Czechoslovakia, and so has to fight against aggressors immensely strengthened. The United States allowed hundreds of thousands of tons of scrap iron to be sold to Japan, and Pearl Harbour was their reward. No amount of casuistry can explain or justify shrinking from duty or desire for gain irrespective of consequences.

HERE are two reasons why we shall win the War:

1. Because Hitler says so. Did he not write in *Mein Kampf?*

> The British nation can be counted upon to carry through to victory any struggle that it once turns upon no matter how long such a struggle may last or however great the sacrifices that may be necessary or whatever the means that have to be employed; and all this even though the actual military equipment at hand may be utterly inadequate when compared with that of other nations.

Despite our crass blundering, incredible sloth, and stupendous stupidity between 1937 and May, 1940, this will turn out to be true. Many people refused to believe *Mein Kampf,* and were rudely disillusioned. Let them take heart from these words.

2. Because a schoolgirl of eleven can write home thus:

> Last night we had a great excitement, a German 'plane flew right over the school in the middle of the night but I wasn't allowed to get up and see it, because I had been naughty.

* * *

To pick up the threads of denominational life is not easy, for the five months of 1942 have been significant months filled with great activity. The two Missionary Societies have published their figures of income for the year ending March 31st, and they are indeed heartening: both in the Rev. Cecil Northcott's brief report, *A City Not Forsaken,* and in the Rev. Norman Goodall's *New Guinea News* there is a vitality which speaks well for the churches in the crisis. Those responsible for the organization of the War Reconstruction Appeal have, we find, been greatly encouraged by the immediate response of the churches and by the readiness of laymen to serve as Commissioners in the different localities. American Christians were greatly impressed on learning that British Congregationalism had already embarked on a campaign to raise £500,000 for reconstruction, and it seems as if the effect on the churches at home has been invigorating.

* * *

CONGREGATIONALISM has suffered exceedingly heavy losses during the last few months. International Congregationalism no longer has a Moderator, for Dr. J. D. Jones, twice Chairman of the Congregational Union of England & Wales and for many years its Honorary Secretary, died on April 19th. Another ex-Chairman of the Union, Dr. E. Griffith-Jones, formerly Principal of the United College, Bradford, died on March 23rd. Appreciations of their long lives and distinguished service appear within.

Across the Atlantic our losses have been even more severe. Governor W. E. Sweet, the Moderator of the General Council of

the Congregational Churches of the U.S.A., Dr. William Horace Day, Prof. Arthur E. Holt, President Irving Maurer, and Dr. C. S. Mills, all of them men of distinction in their respective fields, have all passed on. Dr. Day was one of the most loved and respected of American Congregationalists; he would probably have succeeded Dr. Jones as Moderator of the International Council had the Council met in 1940. He had a unique ministerial career which is in itself a remarkable testimony to his character. Beginning his ministry as assistant to his father in Los Angeles, he became associate-minister, and then senior minister to his own father! Then at the end of his life, in the church at Bridgeport, he repeated the process, calling the Rev. Fred Hoskins to be his assistant, and then in time becoming assistant to his younger colleague.

* * *

THE appearance of *The Confession of an Octogenarian* (Allen & Unwin, 15s.) affords the opportunity to congratulate Dr. L. P. Jacks on his forty years' editorship of the *Hibbert Journal*. In the days of our youth to read the *Hibbert Journal* was the hallmark of the progressive thinker, and its pages have always been a stimulus. True, its philosophical disquisitions have sometimes been too much for the mere historian, and its Eislerian and other speculations have seemed at times to verge on the bizarre, but in general the *Journal* has achieved the purpose of its founders, and that success has been due almost entirely to the wisdom and insight of its editor. Dr. Jacks's *Confession* makes delightful reading; from the vantage point of his eighty years he looks back and moralizes, addressing his youthful self or the reader as fancy strikes him. We have a fascinating account of his youth and of his susceptibility to youthful charmers, of his Samuel Smilesian struggle for education, of his assistantship to Stopford Brooke, one of whose daughters he married, of pastorates in Liverpool and Birmingham, and of teaching in Manchester College, Oxford. All these are the outward expression of endeavours to "complete the Reformation", to "discover the Common Man", and to stress that universal education needed for the satisfactory reconstruction of society.

One thing we looked for in vain: with some surprise we found no mention of Manchester College's neighbour in Oxford: Fairbairn and Gray, Bartlet and Selbie, are as though they had not been. Is there something significant in this strange omission? While Dr. Jacks's eyes are in the ends of the earth, he does not appear to see those nearest to him, either geographically or mentally. Indeed the number of times the Free Churches are mentioned in the *Confession* can be counted on the fingers of one hand.

Expressing our gratitude to Dr. Jacks for the *Hibbert Journal*, and for all his writings—there are some thirty volumes to his name—we would venture the opinion that he will live best in Snarley Bob; *Mad Shepherds*, we learn, was written "for the sheer fun of the thing, without any purpose or *arrière pensée* beyond the pleasure of writing it". It would not be the first time in literary history that an author has been remembered by a book thus written, but Dr. Jacks rightly notes, although "with some astonishment", that "all the cardinal ideas which have determined my thinking are present in that book, though in a half-born condition".

* * *

SPEAKING of the help he received to enable him to become a student of Manchester New College because he was a "promising young man", Dr. L. P. Jacks remarks:

> Dangerously easy, I now think. If I could have my way, which I never have had in that matter and do not hope to get now, I would err on the side of making entry into the ministry difficult rather than easy.

Would that, after the war, all College Boards would act on this sound advice! Naturally they desire that no promising student feeling a call to the ministry should miss training because of lack of means, but too often, in the endeavour to keep up their numbers, Colleges have competed for men, and in some cases the way *has* been made far too easy for those without qualities of character and mind fitting them either to benefit by training or to exercise a fruitful ministry. Is this one of the reasons why the scholar-minister, of whom Congregationalism at one time could rightly be proud, has almost disappeared; and not only the scholar-minister but the man who seemed to step into his pulpit and into the homes of his people as from the presence of God? "What this parish needs", said Carlyle, "is a minister who knows God otherwise than by hearsay". Such were the Dissenting ministers of whom Hazlitt spoke:

> They were true priests. They set up an image in their own minds—it was truth. They worshipped an idol there—it was justice. They looked on man as their brother, and only bowed the knee to the Highest. Separating from the world they walked humbly with their God and in thought with those who had borne testimony of a good conscience, with the spirits of just men in all ages.

Of such there are too few in these tumultuous days. And they will not be forthcoming if young men are pampered and spoilt and the way made easy for them at every turn. This immortal garland, as all others, is to be won not without dust and heat. Fewer and better ministers might not be a bad slogan after the War. But this probably means fewer Colleges, a thing by no means easy to

compass, though here again the War should give the chance of reform. One of these days we hope to print an account of some of the American theological schools, in which, without any compromise of principle, many denominations unite. Union Theological Seminary, New York, has on its staff, under a Presbyterian President, Episcopalians and non-Episcopalians of many denominations; of its 343 students last semester the Presbyterians furnished the largest number with 90: the remainder had a dozen different denominational affiliations.

* * *

BEFORE us lies a letter from an American publisher which tells a sad story:

> Owing to war conditions, arrangements for the issuance of . . . . . in Great Britain have not been effected and it seems now that it will not be generally available ever in an English edition.
>
> Because of transportation difficulties and the lack of sales to justify it, we have had to discontinue sending review copies of any of our publications to Great Britain for the duration of the war.

Many excellent books are now being written in America: some of them are timely, dealing with political concerns; some of them deal with matters that are timeless, throwing light on them for *our* times. But owing to "war conditions" and "transportation difficulties" readers in Britain are to be deprived of the chance of reading such books. How can this—another serious war casualty—be avoided? We trust that someone in the United States—like Dr. James Moffatt, whose eagle eye no book escapes—will at least keep us informed of books British readers ought to see as soon as conditions permit. Meanwhile we hope to refer to such as come to us or as we obtain in the United States.

A book of this kind which recently came into our hands is Prof. Roland H. Bainton's *The Church of Our Fathers* (Scribners, 1941, $2.50). Well illustrated from contemporary sources, this history of the Christian Church is just the thing for young adolescents; we wish that it could be made possible for thousands of children at home, and not only in the United States, to read it.

Dr. G. A. Buttrick's *Prayer* (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, $2.75) has already gone through a large first printing, and we trust it will be widely read in the author's native land. Dr. Buttrick has put much thought into this study, which is worth while for its catena of quotations alone. He divides his treatment into four parts: "Jesus and Prayer"; "Prayer and the World"; "Prayer and Personality"; and "A Way of Prayer". All the great questions that cluster round the subject—Petitionary Prayer, Providence, Intercessory Prayer, Suggestion, Private and Corporate

Prayer—are discussed with intelligence and insight, and the preacher's gift of illustration is often skilfully used. Dr. Buttrick will not always be found satisfying—who could be on such a theme?—but he will make the reader think, and, as we have often said, it is hard thinking that is needed on the subject. Occasionally Dr. Buttrick gives the impression of concern to defend things as they are, or of using the conventional phrases—"the climax of Christian corporate prayer is in the celebration of the Sacrament", *e.g.*—without analysing their meaning or realizing that they may not be in harmony with views he has expressed on other pages. But such instances only underline the hard labour which has gone into both content and form of a book which all Christian ministers should work through.

Another book of importance, Prof. Nels Ferré's *The Christian Faith,* is reviewed within.

* * *

It is perhaps out of the fashion to talk about winning souls, but were a dozen of the leading churches in Britain and the United States to be chosen, and asked how many people with no previous church attachment had become believers during the last year, would the results be considered commensurate with the expenditure involved? We should be glad to be assured that the answer could be in the affirmative.

We recognize the values to be found in worship—the inspiration received from prophetic preaching, fervent prayer, and united praise, when a man's lips have been touched with coal from the altar, and hundreds of voices join in sacred song; but how few of the assemblies of the Church fulfil these conditions! Great areas of empty pews, ill-prepared or gabbled prayers, sermons that have no reality—are these the Church at worship or at work? Dr. Buttrick in his book on *Prayer* says, "Where two or three—or two or three hundred—are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst". But Jesus did not say two or three hundred—He said two or three, perhaps because He knew it was more likely for two or three to be gathered in His name than two or three hundred, where some have come because of custom, some to please a parent, some for love of a woman, and perhaps only a proportion to worship God. How easy it is to make Jesus say what He did not say, but what we would like Him to have said!

Recent experience has not removed the growing conviction that there must be changes in methods of work and worship before the Christian Church can succeed in its appeal to the people—classes and masses alike. The other day in a church which has some of the finest preaching and some of the best music in the United States we could not but feel how out of touch much in the service was to the life and thought of millions of the surrounding

people. Those who like sermons would have appreciated the sermon, those who love music would have enjoyed the music—but, leaving aside the question whether the purpose of worship is the appreciation of sermons and the enjoyment of music, what of the other worshippers? Is the Church only for those accustomed to its conventional forms? Are robed choirs, liturgical services, processional hymns, the means most likely to appeal to the others? We wonder if the Church will not have to begin at the beginning if she is to succeed in her task. Perhaps she will have to be stripped of all her possessions, and learn to rely on the might and power of the living God expressed in the great simplicities of heart speaking to heart in small groups, a man winning his friend. The Church has largely become esoteric in her worship: if all worship is meant to do is to stimulate the devotion of believers, care must be taken that by other means the Church should be endeavouring to convince those who do not believe.

* * *

We are glad to learn that a memoir of Bernard Manning is being prepared by his Jesus College colleague, Mr. Frank Brittain. Mr. Brittain will be glad to receive any correspondence which may be of service.

* * *

Date, please?

> Nowadays everything grows old in a few hours; reputation fades, a work passes away in a moment. Everybody writes; nobody reads seriously.

1836, in Chateaubriand's *Sketches of English Literature.*

* * *

We like the story of the American Negro, confronted by a complicated form relating to national service. He examined it for a time, found himself baffled, and wrote across it, "When I'se wanted, here I is".

* * *

1. Steamer conversation between a Californian and an Englishman:

   Englishman: "And do I understand you to say that in California you have sunshine on 365 days in the year?"

   Californian: "*Yes,* sir! And let me tell you that that's a mighty conservative estimate".

2. One of Dr. H. E. Fosdick's stories:

   Little Girl: "Granpa, were you in Noah's Ark?"
   Granpa: "No, child. Certainly not".
   Little Girl: "Then why weren't you drowned?"

WHAT makes a good hymn? In days when the making of new hymnbooks is postponed for a season it might be well to determine this question in advance. Some much-lauded hymnbooks of the last decade contain a large number of pretty poems which, all right in themselves, are far from serving the end of a hymn—the worship of Almighty God. On a recent Sunday a New York congregation with a world-wide reputation was asked to sing a poem called "God's Plan":

> That cause can neither be lost nor stayed
> Which takes the course of what God has made;
> And is not trusting in walls and towers,
> But slowly growing from seeds to flowers.
>
> Each noble service that men have wrought
> Was first conceived as a fruitful thought;
> Each worthy cause with a future glorious
> By quiet growing becomes victorious.
>
> Thereby itself like a tree it shows:
> That high it reaches, as deep it grows;
> And when the storms are its branches shaking,
> It deeper root in the soil is taking.
>
> Be then no more by a storm dismayed,
> For by it the full-grown seeds are laid;
> And though the tree by its might it shatters,
> What then, if thousands of seeds it scatters?

We will not complain of its poetry, for it is a translation, we suspect from the Danish. But we do suggest it is not a hymn, the essence of which should be the praise of Almighty God. This praises nobody. And in addition, its teaching is harmful to a degree: it suggests automatic progress by growth, and that all seeds are good seeds. There seems nothing left for man to do. What harvests we should have if all seeds were allowed to bear fruit!

* * *

READERS will remember what was said in the Editorial pages of our April number about the volume which is shortly to be published in memory of Dr. Vernon Bartlet, containing his life, his Birkbeck lectures on "Church-Life and Church-Order in the first four centuries", and a bibliography of his published works. It is now becoming clear that a sum of £70 will be needed, over and above what has already been raised, to complete the subsidy required by the publishers to enable them to produce the book. Any of our readers who out of regard for Dr. Bartlet would care to contribute towards this good end should send their offers or remittances to Dr. C. J. Cadoux, 179 Woodstock Road, Oxford.

J. D. JONES[1]

By Dr. Sidney M. Berry, M.A.

A great leader has passed from our midst and joined the shining company. How great a leader few among us can yet realize. We knew him so well. He was one of us. His leadership had no touch of aloofness about it. Strange how some people can more easily detect a leader, or more often still be deluded into thinking that they have found the authentic quality, when a man does not appear in the arena too often. Dr. Jones was not of that kind. He sat with us patiently through commonplace and wearying committees. He collected money for our funds. He was one of us, shouldering the humdrum burdens himself. And we all knew him as "J.D.". The great leader is not easy to recognize when he wears that garb. But great leader he was, and a far greater one than if he had cultivated remoteness and carefully calculated the number of appearances it was wise to make. He saw the need of that loosely knit fellowship of independent churches. His vision swept forward to the developments of an age in which the churches would be compelled to plan and work together if they were to survive at all. If that is not the mark of true statesmanship, then I have mistaken the quality altogether. For myself I am confident that if through this long period of turbulence and unsettlement we retain clearness of memory, Dr. Jones's statesmanship will stand out even more clearly in the years ahead of us than it does now. But in a sense his high statesmanship was not the result of calculation. It arose from something at once simpler and deeper. His policies were always inspired by his inmost convictions about the nature of the Church and its work in the world. Building everything on the foundation of a deep personal religion, he saw that the fellowship of believers must have a wider bound than the life of the individual church. The possibility that Church fellowship in the narrow sense might leave the country church or the down town church to fight their grim battle alone and unaided was a contradiction of everything which he understood by the word. And so he spoke and toiled and begged to give form to a new and larger conception of the relationship of the churches to each other in the wider fellowship of the Congregational Union.

[1] A book just published contains a fine tribute to Dr. Jones: *Parson's Progress* is the autobiography of the Rev. A. W. Hopkinson, for many years the incumbent of S. Augustine's Church, Bournemouth. Speaking of the Nonconformists of the town, he writes:

> Their leader was Dr. J. D. Jones, who carried on a notable ministry at Richmond Hill Chapel for more than forty years. He was a great preacher. He was, also, the uncrowned king of Bournemouth, and it was commonly supposed that the Mayor was often chosen at Richmond Hill. It was a pity that, in his later years, there was no outstanding leader of the Church of England to meet him on his own level, and bring about a more fruitful co-operation.

Editor.

Whatever unions of a closer kind may be achieved among Churches in the future, his work will be given a distinct and distinguished place by the historian. It is this side of his work which I am stressing here. A comprehensive tribute would demand far greater space than is available, for the amazing fact about Dr. Jones is the many-sidedness of his work. Where other men drew boundaries round their work, he spent himself ungrudgingly. But that story is well known to us all and needs no further emphasis from me.

It is with a sense of loss, but even more with deep thanksgiving, that I write these lines about a beloved friend and colleague. The many stories about him will gradually fade into silence; memory will lose its vividness as his friends and contemporaries pass one by one, but he has built himself into the life of the whole denomination, and so long as there are Congregational churches at all the name of J. D. Jones will take a high place on its roll of honour.

E. GRIFFITH-JONES

By the Rev. John A. Patten, M.C., M.A.

English Congregationalism owes much to Wales, and the names of two distinguished Welshmen who have recently passed from us spring to the lips—Dr. J. D. Jones and Dr. E. Griffith-Jones. Their careers ran on parallel lines in the life of our English churches for fifty years, and there were many similarities. Born in the same decade, both received their theological training at English colleges; both spent their active ministerial life in England (except that Griffith-Jones had a short Welsh pastorate in his younger days); both wrote a large number of widely-read books; both reached the offices of Chairman of the Congregational Union of England and Wales and President of the National Free Church Council; both received honorary D.D. degrees from Scottish Universities; both, upon retirement, returned to the land of their fathers; and they died within a few weeks of each other.

Ebenezer Griffith-Jones, born in 1860, declared on his eightieth birthday in 1940 that, having lived half his life in the nineteenth century and half in the twentieth, he found both good. He found most things good. Blessed with a buoyant temperament, he tackled life and its problems with a zeal that never flagged. After short pastorates at St. John's Wood, Llanelly, and Stroud Green, he entered in 1898 upon a nine years' pastorate at Balham, and it was during his Balham ministry that he published the book by which he will be remembered—*The Ascent through Christ*. It appeared opportunely. The conflict between religion and science was raging; many were perplexed as to how the assured findings

of science could be reconciled with Christian faith; and Griffith-Jones's book was welcomed by pulpit and pew.

His translation from the friendly stir of a busy London pastorate to the comparative seclusion of the principalship of a Yorkshire college was not easily borne, but in due time he came to rejoice in his new work. In those first years at Bradford he never tired of holding up to his students his own high conception of the ministry and the incomparable opportunity of the preacher: his own pastoral experiences were often drawn upon for illustrations.

Much, perhaps too much, has been made of his absent-mindedness. It has been said that we acquired the British Empire in a fit of absent-mindedness; and it has to be recorded of this absent-minded professor that he faithfully performed the duties of his office for twenty-five years; won and retained the loyalty of successive generations of students; wrote a whole series of valuable books; took an active part in the discussion of public questions; and exercised year in year out a preaching ministry through the length and breadth of the land.

F. J. FOAKES-JACKSON, D.D., D.Th., D.Litt.[1]

By Professor Ernest F. Scott, D.D.,
Union Theological Seminary, New York.

It is impossible to sum up in a few sentences a life so full and many-sided as that of our late colleague, Professor Foakes-Jackson. He was over eighty when he died, and was active almost to the end. He took a notable part in the academical work of two countries. He was the author of some thirty books, every one of them a real contribution to knowledge. Outside of his special field of church history he had a surprising range of interests, and made his mark in all of them. To mention only a few. He was an ardent Freemason, and held a rank in that world-wide order which was only one or two steps below the highest. For a number of years he was the leading spirit in the Cambridge University Boat Club, and it was largely through him that Cambridge formed the exasperating habit of winning the boat race every year. At one time he edited a newspaper, and acquired an almost dangerous knowledge of the inside workings of politics. While he was deeply read in the Church Fathers, he was equally at home in regions of literature which had little to do with them. One day when I called on him during his last illness he told me that he had

[1] War-time delays sometimes bring compensations; one of them was the privilege of attending the *Alumni* Association of Union Theological Seminary, New York, when Dr. Scott delivered this address.—Editor.

passed a sleepless night, and had spent the time in making a list of all the characters he could think of in *The Pickwick Papers*, which he had not read for some years. "I am afraid", he said, "that my mind is failing; I could only remember forty-seven". Apart from particular interests, he took a keen delight in all kinds of society. With his brilliant powers of conversation he was made welcome everywhere, and had known personally most of the prominent men of his time—archbishops, Cabinet Ministers, generals, leaders in science, and at least one famous murderer. To all of them he had applied his shrewd judgment, and was never imposed on by show and reputation. It was well, perhaps, that he confined his writings to ancient history. He could have published volumes on quite modern history, in Church and State, which would have shaken down many of our idols, but he reserved all this for the enlightenment of his friends.

I have dwelt on these side-interests of Dr. Jackson because they have a real bearing on the historical work by which he is known to the world. His books have many excellences. For one thing, he was the master of a pure, natural English, delightful to read after the clumsy literary jargons to which we are accustomed. In his language, as in his cast of thought, he recalled the eighteenth century, which was his favourite period, and which he knew better, perhaps, than any other man. Along with his gift of style he had an amazing fund of knowledge, and it was not worked up for the occasion, out of note-books and encyclopedias. He had a memory which seemed to retain everything, and the facts were all inside of him, and had become part of the substance of his own mind. Pedantic critics were fond of accusing him of carelessness, and I daresay he sometimes went wrong about a date, or the spelling of a name. He was quite capable of these enormities, and I do not defend him. But if he was careless it was because he knew his subject so well that he did not need to be always turning up the dictionary. When it came to grasp of a situation, or clear judgment on the meaning of events, he was seldom wrong. But the chief excellence of his work, to my mind, was his feeling for life. He was a man of broad humanity, who had known the world, and interested himself in men and things. He studied the past in the light of all his experience, as if he were actually living in it. When he was discussing an ancient Church Council I have noticed him slip unconsciously into the present tense. He seemed to forget that those solemn ecclesiastical humbugs had been safely dead for fifteen centuries! He was looking straight at them, and seeing through them, just as he might have done with a roomful of living bishops. Whatever else we get from Dr. Jackson's work, he always gives us this sense that something real is happening; and this, I would say, is the highest gift of the historian.

It was this power of breathing life into his subject which made him so successful as a teacher. His method was unconventional, or perhaps he had no method; but he got his students to feel that those bygone events meant something, and were worth thinking about. When he found any spark of enthusiasm he fostered it, and would often kindle it when it was not there. He also won a very real personal affection. This he did by no professional arts but by honestly liking his pupils, and doing all that he could to help them. He remembered, I think, every man he had taught during half a century, and the success of an old student always filled him with pride. He never said much about his own work, but was constantly praising the men he had trained, and whom he regarded almost as his children. This love which he had for them was amply returned, and nothing is more remarkable in recent theological literature than the number of books dedicated to Dr. Jackson. One could form a small library out of them, and it would include the work of some of the most distinguished scholars of our time. These dedications all express the warmest gratitude to one who was not only a great teacher but the best of friends. Once I heard him startle a meeting of social zealots with this little speech:

> I have lived a long time, and as I look back on all my follies I am humbled to the dust; but this at least I can truly say, that I have never tried to do good to anybody.

Here, as always, there was a serious meaning beneath his humour. He had a deep respect for personal liberty, and wanted everyone to manage his own life, without interference from well-meaning busybodies. He had also a strong dislike for official benevolence, prompted by a sense of duty. His own kindness was all spontaneous, pouring out of a large nature which could not help being generous. All his life he was doing kind things, often at much cost to himself, but he was never trying to do them. He had forgotten them, as a rule, the moment after they were done. And this unconscious goodness which he carried about with him was the secret of his charm. You felt, as soon as you met with him, that here was a man overflowing with human kindness. He was a great scholar and teacher, a writer of outstanding gifts, whose work will be long remembered. But those of us who knew him will always think of him as an ideal friend, who made the world brighter because he lived in it.

THREE ELEMENTS IN ESSENTIAL CALVINISM

By P. Carnegie Simpson, D.D.
(*Emeritus Professor of Church History in Westminster College, Cambridge*).

It is interesting to observe how, under the strain of the war, some of the stronger and even sterner figures in our political and religious history are experiencing if not a popularity at least a respect which, in the easier and shallower times of peace, was often denied to them. Thus, in the political sphere, Cromwell is not infrequently quoted today by persons who are by no means of the Puritan persuasion, but who feel in their hearts, if they do not say it in words, that it were well if he were "living at this hour". In the sphere of religion and theology, an instance is Calvin, a marked revival of interest in whom may be seen in widely differing quarters; and many even of those antipathetic to the doctrinal system associated with his name are recognizing that this system, whatever its faults, had elements which have proved their strength, and from these we might well learn something in these critical times.

Of Calvinism, therefore, I propose to say something in what follows. I can make no attempt to survey it as a whole, and shall confine our attention to three topics. These are chosen from the more valuable elements in Calvin's work—which has other elements not so admirable—and, indeed, may be said to comprise the essential Calvinism. The three topics are, first, the basis of the system in what Calvin calls "the Word of God"; secondly, his dominant idea or category, which is none other than the supremacy of God Himself; and, thirdly, the practical application of his doctrine in life and its influence in history. It is not necessary to spend time on what is general and introductory; and we pass at once to consider these three subjects in succession.

I. The basis of all Calvin's doctrine is what he calls "the Word of God". The expression is not so simple and its meaning is not so immediate as may seem. As a matter of fact, it has been used in the history of religious thought with a wide variety of significance, from the eternal Logos to the canonical Scriptures. Let us see what Calvin means by it.

Many people will at once say that he means the Bible. But it is just this which needs to be examined.

As the *Institutio*—which, for some unknown reason, is generally called in English *The Institutes* (in the plural)—opens with the discussion of the topic of Holy Scripture, we may and should start

from this. We must, however, start from it, as Calvin most explicitly does, with the Reformation idea of what the Bible essentially is and why it is the "Word of God". This idea can be stated in a sentence or two. In the medieval Church, the Bible—apart from the recital of certain portions by the clergy in their offices—was not regarded as a book of religious edification, but was rather a repository of dogma which the Church was to interpret, and therefore was for the use of the professional theologian more than for that of the pious soul. It was this view which, at the Reformation, was found to be a complete misapprehension of what the Bible really and essentially is. When, through the work, first, of Erasmus and, later, of Luther and others, the book began to be read by the people, it was found that, while of course it contains doctrine or the material for doctrine, it is really and essentially a medium through which God speaks by His Spirit to the believing mind and heart and conscience about the things of salvation and life. Here is verily "the Word of God". This Word of God (with a capital W) is not merely the words (with a small w) of the Bible. It is *God speaking to the soul in and through the Bible*. The discovery or realization of this was what gave the book its place both in the spiritual life and in the theological doctrine of the Reformation.

Now, this is the very kernel of Calvin's view of the Bible as the Word of God and, more generally, as the authority for truth in religion. To say—as so often is said—that what was done at the Reformation was to substitute an infallible book for an infallible pope is entirely to fail to appreciate what happened, and is certainly to fail to state justly Calvin's doctrine. For him, the authority in religion is not a book *qua* book, but is what he describes as *testimonium Spiritus Sancti internum*. He is explicit and emphatic on this. The truth, he says, "will never gain credit in the hearts of men till it be confirmed by the internal testimony of the Spirit". Again, "that alone", he maintains, "is true faith which the Spirit of God seals in our hearts". Here is the genuine Reformation doctrine—certainly the genuine Calvinistic doctrine—about the Bible as the Word of God and the authority for religious truth. It has been admirably expressed by an illustrious scholar of the last generation—William Robertson Smith—who always claimed that he stood for the Calvinistic position in this matter. "If", he said,

> I am asked why I receive Scripture as the Word of God and as the only perfect rule of faith and life, I answer, with all the fathers of the protestant church, because the Bible is the only record of the redeeming love of God, and because in the Bible alone I find God drawing near to man in Christ Jesus and declaring to us in Him His will for our salvation; and this record I know to be true by the witness of the Holy Spirit in my

heart, whereby I am assured that none other than God Himself is able to speak such words to my soul.

Thus, in the Calvinistic doctrine on this subject, there are found two elements—the one, the written Scripture, and the other, the spiritual witness. These are to be distinguished from one another; and even when it is said that the Bible is the Word of God, the copula "is" does not mean identity. But, while distinguishable, they are not to be dissociated from one another. On both of these points—the distinction between the two elements and also their association—a few words may be said.

Their distinction shows that the Calvinistic doctrine of Scripture is not what may be described as a bibliolatry. In particular—and the fact that the sentences just quoted from William Robertson Smith come from a protagonist of what is known as the "higher criticism" evidences this—it means that Calvin's position is not tied up with any insistence on plenary inspiration or verbal inerrancy or any proscription of a free critical examination of the authorship or construction of Scripture. It was a post-Reformation school which set up these ideas, which are no part of the doctrine of the *testimonium internum* witnessing to itself in Scripture. In saying this, I do not mean that Calvin himself held the position of the higher criticism. In his age the critical question had not arisen. What I am saying is that his doctrine of Scripture as the Word of God does not foreclose critical liberty; and, as a matter of fact, that liberty has been admitted in the Churches of the Calvinistic tradition. Into this we need not here go further.

More important—not in itself but for the modern mind—is the association of the two elements of the external written Scripture and the internal spiritual testimony. Here is a position of capital value for the whole question of the seat of authority in religion.

In discussions of this question of authority there is too often found a persistent tendency to set the outward and the inward against one another, and so to make them contradictory instead of —as they really are—complementary. One of the commonest and most misleading sources of error in thinking—hardly less common or misleading than the loose use of undefined terms—is the setting up of false antitheses. The question before us supplies an example of this. There is the type of mind which says that the authority for religious truth is in something outward—an infallible Church or an inspired Bible—and *not* in inward reason or conviction. There is the other type of mind which says this authority must be found within and is *not* in anything external. But the fact is that these two positions need one another, and neither is sufficient without the other. To say that the authority is outward is certainly not enough. No merely outward authority, by itself, can really give us the knowledge of spiritual truth, which, indeed, is truth for us

only as it is our own experience. So the outward needs the inward. On the other hand, the inward by itself is not sufficient. Many a man has been sincerely convinced of what is error and, indeed, of what is evil. And even when the inward conviction is of what is good, it is not sufficient, for it often cannot rid itself of the haunting fear that, lacking any external corroboration, this may be no more than subjective impression which may not correspond with objective reality. So the inward needs the outward. The two, I repeat, are complementary to one another, and neither without the other is perfect. The sufficient and sure basis for truth in religion is where these two *interlock*. Not only spiritual truth generally, but Christianity in particular, rests on this two-fold basis. Pre-eminently is this true of what I am fond of calling the "Fact of Christ". Jesus Christ is a fact in history as external as Julius Cæsar; also is He a fact in experience as intimate as human love. Far from this making what T. H. Green called "a cleft in faith", it is the mutual corroboration of the two elements which gives to Christian faith its peculiar assurance, the experiential making it religiously real and the historical guaranteeing it from mere subjectivity.

Here, then, is the two-fold basis for authoritative truth in religion. I do not suggest that Calvin states it in this explicit form; but what has been said is essentially his doctrine of the Word of God. This two-fold basis is to be found not, indeed, for all ecclesiastical dogmas, but for the central and vital things of faith and life. Such things are creed enough.

II. We pass now to our second topic—the dominant idea or category in Calvin.

It is erroneous to identify Calvinism—as so many do—with predestination or, indeed, with any single doctrine. Earlier theologians may be associated with special topics—Athanasius with the Incarnation, Augustine with grace, Anselm with the Atonement. But Calvin surveys the whole range of theology, the only limit being that he confines himself to what is within Scripture, and refrains—as the Scholastics did not refrain—from merely speculative problems in theology. Still, while thus comprehensive, Calvinism has an unmistakable unity; and it is here that its dominant and characteristic idea is to be found. What is this unifying principle? The answer is that *Calvinism is the system which relates everything to the one and supreme concept or category of God.* The doctrine of election or predestination is but one instance of this; it is the particular matter of salvation thus related or subordinated to this general and universal principle, which is far larger than this or any other single application of it. Calvinism is only incidentally predestinarian; what it is, fundamentally and essentially, is

theocentric. I am, of course, aware that, in days after Calvin and when the Reformed theology got into conflict with what is known as Arminianism, emphasis came to be laid on the Calvinistic doctrine of election, and what were called the "Six Points of Calvinism" were all points about this particular topic. But this was in later controversy; and controversy always gets things out of their true proportions. The authentic and original Calvinism—the Calvinism of Calvin himself in the *Institutio*—is not dominated by this or any other single doctrine, and is dominated by the one supreme thought of God.

Moreover and further, we again do injustice to Calvin when we think of this relating and subordinating of everything to God as merely an abstract doctrine of what is called "Divine Sovereignty". Certainly God is Sovereign, which is only another way of saying that God is God. But, to Calvin, this is not to be conceived of in a doctrinaire or metaphysical way. As I have already said, he is not speculative. He does not enter into discussions of God's being or nature. He asks:

> How can man's mind penetrate into the essence of the Divine being, when it is ignorant of its own?

Calvin realized that we cannot—so to phrase it—construe God; and he concludes that "we must leave to God the knowledge of himself". This is a true Christian agnosticism; and for such agnosticism there is room within even the religion of revelation. And this avoidance of mere speculation in theology saves Calvin from the besetting sin of theologians, which is disputation about words. "I really abominate", he declares—would all theologians felt the same!—"contentions about words", especially "exotic words". Indeed, he were willing that the terminology of even Trinitarianism be "buried in oblivion", if the faith it expresses—God as One, and yet differentiated within the unity—is received. What, then, if neither abstract speculation nor technical terminology, is it that Calvin investigates? The answer is that it is God working in and over all things. This is what the Divine Sovereignty means to Calvin. It is not a metaphysical idea; it is the living God acting in and over the whole world of nature and of life.

What Calvin says of God's operation in the world of nature is not of special value for us, since, of course, he had nothing of the modern scientific conception of a rational universe, or of an evolutionary process which develops from primeval slime to moral personality. What, for his age, is notable is his insistence that God is to be seen in all phenomena, and not merely in the miraculous or supernatural. To him, "all facts are God's facts"; and this really—though Calvin had not this intention—is the religious recognition of what we call science. In his discussion of God's

sovereign relation to life, Calvin's open eyes see the difficulties for faith, since there are facts in life which it is not easy to ascribe to the action of Divine goodness and care. It even looks, he says, "as if human affairs were conducted by a blind force of fortune", and "as though God amused Himself by tossing men about like tennis-balls"—the latter a startling phrase to find in the writings of an orthodox divine, and one which recalls or, rather, anticipates Thomas Hardy's bitter conclusion to *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*, "The President of the Immortals had finished his sport with Tess". Calvin's way of meeting these difficulties—which is, practically, that the "final issue" even of the dark facts of life is found to have moral meaning, and that, beyond this, we must not and cannot "scrutinize God's secret counsels" and "pass a precipitate judgment on things unknown"—may not satisfy the mind; but to such facts of life no theology or philosophy has a demonstrable answer. Calvin, at least, offers no facile optimism, and is not evasive. His task, however, is not primarily that of the apologist.

It is when he comes to the sphere of the life of the soul that his discussions in the *Institutio* become characteristic not only of his thinking about God but also of the new note which the Reformation brought into theology. The notable thing here is that the discussion is not an exercise in dialectical reason but an exposition of spiritual experience. This is a great change from the Scholastic theology. Take, for example, the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas. In this monument of Scholasticism there is nothing of experimental religion. Let not such a remark be misunderstood. I do not for a moment suggest that Aquinas himself was not a man of spiritual and even saintly mind and life. On the contrary, his prayers and hymns—one of which is part of the Roman service of Benediction—are examples of the flower of medieval piety. But nothing of this appears in his theological system, which is the analysis of the Church's dogma in terms of Aristotelian logic. As such, its open-mindedness, its statement of both sides of a question, its exactitude in the use of words, its unambiguous conclusions—all these intellectual virtues command admiration. But when we think of what Christian truth is as it enters into the Christian's life, when we think of such topics as sin and salvation and grace, then we must feel that these are things of more than logic and that they can be truly discussed only in terms of religion. Whatever faults Calvin's treatment of these themes may have, it certainly has the great merit of being religious.

Perhaps the most signal example of this is the topic which I have already mentioned as often erroneously taken to be the capital doctrine in the Calvinistic system but which, as I have shown, is only one particular in the larger category of the supremacy of God in everything—the doctrine, I mean, of election

or predestination. I do not propose here to enter into discussion of this doctrine, for it is really not part of the essential Calvinism —rather, indeed, is it of the essential Augustinianism—though the logic of the Genevan reformer's resolute mind led him to articulate it with a new precision and to carry out its conclusions unflinchingly. But let us look at how it illustrates the religious as distinguished from the metaphysical or merely dialectical in Calvin's theological method.

This is apparent if we note the place where this doctrine arises in the *Institutio*. It does not arise in the first book, where the nature of the being of God is discussed. It is not considered or even named till the third book, which describes the experience of salvation. Therefore it is not—as I have already maintained it is not—an abstract principle about God, which is to rule the whole subsequent system; it is a spiritual fact in the life of the man who knows that God in Christ has redeemed him. Its ground is thus religious, not metaphysical or logical. Indeed, the place in which it is introduced in the *Institutio* is even more remarkable and significant. The subject of election is discussed immediately after a chapter not on God's sovereign will or man's spiritual impotence but on *prayer*. In prayer we say, "Create in me a clean heart, O God". For Calvin—as for Augustine—a doctrine of salvation not by our merits or efforts but by the sheer grace of God is the doctrine corresponding to such a prayer. A line in a familiar hymn says that we should "live more nearly as we pray". Calvin, in his doctrine of our salvation as the creation of God's originating and enabling grace, seems to say we should *think* more nearly as we pray. And such a way of thinking is true to the experience of the Christian man, who is surer of nothing more than, if he is saved, it is not of his own doing but of God's free mercy and grace.

Thus, in Calvin, the idea of predestination emerges not—as it does in the Scholastic theologians—as a metaphysical principle of Divine causality, but as a fact in religious experience; and the doctrine of predestination is the intellectual construction and expression of this fact. This, while it is deep, is not in itself dark. Whence, then, the dark problem about predestination which has made the doctrine, to many, so difficult and even repellent? This arises, for Calvin, not out of any theological perversity on his part, but from the facts of life, which seem indisputably to show that all men are not saved. What is to be made of this in view of the premiss, which religious experience has just asserted, that salvation is of God's free grace? If this saving grace is given to one—and that not because he is more meritorious—why is it not given to another and why not to all? It is to Calvin's intellectual and moral credit that he did not shirk this question. And if it is not shirked, what answer is there but that God, Who out of his free

grace saves some, does not save others? There is no use denouncing this conclusion unless you deny the data. Calvin could not deny the data, and his logical and truth-seeking mind drew the conclusion—dark though he felt it to be—unflinchingly. It was T. H. Huxley who said of Calvinism that it was the only system of theology which faced the facts.

Although, as I have said, I do not here enter into the general discussion of this doctrine, it cannot be left at this *impasse,* and I shall add a word on Calvin's statement of it.

It is, I repeat, to his credit that he faces the facts. What he fails to recognize is that these facts—namely, that salvation is of God's free grace, and yet only some and not all are saved—are not isolated or independent or ultimate facts, but must be viewed as belonging to a deeper and fundamental fact behind them. This deeper and fundamental fact is the nature of the relationship between man and God. This relationship is of a two-fold character. On the one hand, it is a differentiation; man is not identical with God. But, on the other hand, it is not a separateness; man is not outside God. The two-fold relationship is summed up in the Pauline words, "In God we live and move and have our being". There is the differentiation of human personality; "*we* live" and have "*our* being". Yet it is "*in* God"; and there is the subordination of our being to the all-inclusive and infinite being of God, outside of Whom nothing is. Now, it is when this two-fold relationship of man to God is forgotten or denied, and when—to quote the words of F. H. Bradley—"man irreligiously thinks of himself and God as two finite persons", existing and operating outside of one another, that the *impasse* between Divine sovereignty and human freedom arises. Even when the facts are placed in this larger setting the problem is not solved. But, in this setting, these facts no longer present a mere and sheer contradiction between an external sovereignty and a self-enclosed freedom. Moreover, we now see why the problem is beyond our solution in terms. It is beyond us to reach a synthesis of its factors because we cannot rationalize this two-fold relationship between the Creator Who is infinite and the creature who is finite; and we cannot, so to speak, go behind its operation to explain it. Further still, we now see that this problem has not been invented by theologians, but is one inherent in all philosophy of the relation between the infinite and the finite. In philosophy, this may be obscured and, therefore, is more easily evaded, because there the action of the infinite is dimmed and blurred through the abstractness of impersonal categories; whereas, in religion—especially in Christianity—such action is conceived of as in the full sense that of a personal God, and so the issue is clearer and sharper. But, essentially and ultimately, the problem is the same for a philosophy of the infinite as

it is for a theology of grace; and, if Augustine or Calvin leaves it a mystery, so not less does Spinoza or Hegel. At that, then, we need not be ashamed to leave it.

Here, too, I am afraid we must leave—too brief and most inadequate as our discussion has been—this section of our subject.

III. I shall deal even more briefly—indeed, in but a couple of paragraphs or so—with the last of the three aspects of Calvinism proposed at the outset for consideration here, namely, its practical application and its influence in history.

From the first, Calvinism was a public polity as well as a scientific theology. The Genevan Reformation was this to a degree never attained by the German. In the latter, Luther had a message of liberating power for the individual soul; he also greatly influenced family life. But the social and political, as well as the religious, situation in his country was very complicated; and he never had a fair chance or a free hand—even if, given these, his genius was of the kind to make good use of them—to work out the public problems of the Church and of the State in Germany. With Calvin it was different. Geneva was an area of limited extent; its authorities had accepted the Reformation; and the people were practically all Protestants. Moreover, Calvin himself had the qualities of a statesman as well as the capacities of a theologian. Here, he could set himself to the practical task of building up a city of God as well as write the *Institutio*. This practical task he carried out in a characteristically thorough fashion. Of this, it may be said at once that, while he achieved much, his methods are not a model for our imitation. His ideal was the highest. His public polity was inspired by the same dominant thought that we have seen to be capital in his theology—that the Word and Will of God are supreme. He would have nothing to do with the modern blasphemy that the State is its own absolute and its self-interest is its final law. God is the only absolute and the Word of God is the law of nations and peoples as well as in the soul. Inspired by this ideal, Geneva, under Calvin's influence—and it is to be remembered that his influence was entirely personal and spiritual, for he had no control of armed force—became a remarkable city, not only morally but also intellectually, and even in such matters as public health and so on. Certainly Calvinistic Geneva was a very different place from Papal Avignon, which was a city of ill-fame. All this is to be recognized and appreciated even by a critic of Calvin. On the other hand, even his partisan must admit that the Genevan civil polity was a discipline and an inquisitorial tyranny which was intolerable. The centuries-long ecclesiastical tradition in such matters which Calvin inherited may, in part, account for this; and after all, the Calvinistic rule in Geneva was only one strong man

doing successfully what many a medieval ecclesiastic would do if he could. Still, it is strange that a man of Calvin's great practical insight and capacity did not see—as has been demonstrated again and again in history and not least in Church history—that moral discipline can do only what it can do, which may be something but is not everything or even very much, and that, when it is carried beyond a certain point, it only defeats itself and does more harm than good. But, while this is to be said about Calvin's methods, it remains true and should not be forgotten that, in Geneva, he proclaimed before all Reformed Christendom that *religion is for the community as well as for the individual* and that *social righteousness is part of the programme of Christianity*. Are not these the very ideas which, in so many quarters, we are today being told that the Church must learn and put into practical action?

A closing word on the influence of Calvinism in history on the lives of nations and peoples.

In at least one respect this is truly remarkable. In the popular mind—and not without reason—Calvinism is associated with what is rigid in doctrine and repressive in discipline. Yet, as a matter of historical fact, it was out of the Calvinistic tradition, more than any other, that political freedom was achieved and maintained in Europe and beyond. Why was this? How, from apparently so arid a soil, did there come so fair a harvest? The answer is not other than that in Calvin which I have, more than once or twice in this discussion, said is his dominant thought — the thought, namely, of the sole final supremacy of God. Whatever defects or worse Calvinism may have had, it did bring men's minds and lives into direct and personal relationship with, responsibility to, and reliance upon God Himself. Again and again in Calvin's writings occurs the expression *coram Deo*—"in God's presence". Men who have got that into their blood are not men ready to bow to any earthly usurper or tyrant. True, in the first instance, this is concerned with the freedom of the soul and conscience; and, in history, it did not immediately mean also intellectual and civil freedom. But, as has been well said, "freedom is one thing", and, when it is awakened regarding the life of the soul before God, it spreads—and, again, in history it did spread—over all life. Thus is it we find that it was children of the Reformation and, in particular, of the Genevan Reformation, who in the Netherlands were the first to establish the institutions of democratic liberty; who, in England, taught the most fatal—not personally the worst—of the Stuart Kings that the days of royal absolutism in that country were ended; who, in the *Mayflower,* carried the ideals of civil freedom across the Atlantic to plant them in the virgin soil of the new world. These are events of long past days; but they have meaning for this very hour, in which freedom—civil, intellectual, moral, religious—

is menaced by the powers of evil as it has never been in the whole course of modern history. To its defence must rally all who believe in man, whether or not they believe in God. But faith in man is strongest when it stands upon faith also in God. And the final, indefeasible citadel even of secular freedom is not a political theory of human rights—any of which may, for sufficient reasons, be surrendered—but is a soul that knows it belongs to God, a conscience that must obey Him rather than men, and a life that is inspired and sustained by the faith that it is lived under His eternal purpose, Whose will is its sure foundation and Whose service its chief end.

Mr. Alec Craig's rather absurdly entitled *Above All Liberties* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) continues the study of obscenity—perhaps we should say the campaign—begun in *The Banned Books of England*, though in the present work he goes farther afield and examines the law and its administration in both France and the United States. We are all in favour of the freedom of the press, and Mr. Craig could have rendered better service had he provided an objective account of the law and past history, and give some indication that he realized the difficulty of the problem. But he has violent prejudices, and really has no solution to offer. Granted that no obstacle should be put in the way of the publication of scientific works dealing with sex, abnormalities, and the like, how can this be secured with playing into the hands of the pornographer, and without subjecting children and adolescents to encounters with matters beyond their years? One need not be a "prurient Puritan"—Mr. Craig's *bête noire*—to see that there must be control somewhere.

A recent visit to International House, New York, added interest to Miss Mary Trevelyan's *From the Ends of the Earth* (Faber, 7s. 6d.), a fascinating account of the work of International House, London, where the author has been Warden since the opening in 1932. Miss Trevelyan criticizes—justly, we think—the three American International Houses (in Berkeley, Chicago, and New York) as too large, too expensive, and as having only a small percentage of foreign students. They are residential as the London House is not, and this fact has enabled poor students to secure the amenities the "Student Movement House" could offer. The lively time Miss Trevelyan has had since 1932 will be understood when it is remembered that Chinese and Japanese, Italians and Ethiopians, Poles, Czechs, and Germans have been members together. During these years Miss Trevelyan also visited India, the Far East, and America to meet her scattered flock and study her problem; her conclusions are as sound and reasonable as her style is racy. An admirable piece of work aptly described.

SOCIAL JUSTICE

By the Rev. William Dick, M.A., Poplar.

It is an astonishing matter that anyone should have to submit a plea for social justice after nearly twenty centuries of the Gospel. It is still more astonishing that there should be found members of churches, professing Christian people, who look askance at any phrase which contains the word "social", declare that it savours of politics, that we should leave such affairs to the experts, and get on with our business of saving souls. And so the cause of social justice goes by default. And so this mad, bad world whirls on its way. And so the coming of the Kingdom of right is frustrated, not only by the evil man's opposition, but also by the good man's neglect.

Yet that is not by any means the whole of the story. Here and there may be heard many voices inviting consideration of this all-important theme. All over Britain today there are groups of earnest folk thinking and studying, planning and praying, and gradually creating for themselves and for others a picture of what this better Britain should appear. These groups are doing valiant service, and are wise enough to know that such service should be rendered now, and not postponed till the war is over. It is to be hoped that they will not be content merely to formulate and broadcast their particular views, that they will all get together quickly, and by the unity of their vision and the unanimity of their action compel the attention of people and statesmen to their solution of the problems at issue. For the forces on the other side are powerful and they are organized. There are ominous signs that these reactionary minds mean by peace simply a return to things as they were. It is almost certain that they will throw in all the weight they can against a permanent and radical betterment in the people's way of living. At best they can intervene with delaying tactics. At worst, if need be, they may count on the support of authority and the good old army and police.

These scattered groups, these many prophetic movements, must be harmonized and unified. But it is chiefly important that their social passion should be founded on social fact. It is no use our going into this struggle moved by a feeling of vague humanitarianism. The right kind of enthusiasm can emerge only from the right kind of knowledge. Here our Missionary Societies have taught us an incomparable lesson. There is a tremendous amount of real live missionary enthusiasm in our churches today, and it is built almost entirely on missionary information. Our great Mis-

sionary Societies have month by month made it their business to pour out a stream of missionary fact, and it is that which, possibly, more than anything, has kept alive the missionary zeal of large numbers of humble folk. It is a misfortune that there has been found no one to do in the cause of social justice what these Societies are constantly doing in the interests of a world-wide service. If we could have a periodical like the London Missionary Society *Chronicle* published month by month in the interests of an elementary social knowledge there would be a notable and steady rise in the temperature of social enthusiasm.

Here are two publications that deal with social fact, and here is one which professes to lead the way out of the social impasse.

The first of our instructors is a portentous volume by Mr. B. Seebohm Rowntree — *Poverty and Progress: a Second Social Survey of York* (Longmans, 15s.). It contains a careful, patient, and competent account of the conditions of the workers in the city of York in the year 1936. With the help of an army of sympathetic investigators, well coached for their task and provided with carefully catalogued documents, Mr. Rowntree has succeeded in constructing a graphic and convincing picture of social conditions in York just before the outbreak of war. It is not to be taken for granted that his findings have been out-dated or nullified by the artificial prosperity which has come in the wake of the present world conflict. On the contrary, the conditions which he describes are still there, lurking just a little beneath the surface, and waiting like grim black rocks to be laid bare again when the tides of war recede. The volume merits the closest and most careful study on the part of those who wish to be acquainted with the condition of this our country.

Information has been gathered as the result of house-to-house visits to 16,362 families "comprising 55,206 persons living in 15,372 separate dwellings", "57 per cent of the entire population of the city", "practically every working-class family in York". It will be seen that here is no hit-or-miss calculation obtained by examining a cross-section of the city's life, or taking as specimens one family in five or ten or a hundred. We are provided with a broad substantial basis of social fact, and we may safely pass on to the conclusion that what is true of York is true of working-class England.

Here is a *précis* of the social facts thus arranged:

It was necessary at the outset to determine the position of the poverty line, and Mr. Rowntree has arrived at the sum of 43s. 6d. a week left after paying rent and rates, for a family of five people consisting of man, wife and three dependent children, the prices being those prevailing in 1936. In fixing this amount the writer acknowledges that he is "adopting the lowest standard which re-

sponsible experts can justify". Taking this as a measuring-rod we inquire about the incidence of poverty in York and probably throughout England. Here is the answer given quite definitely in terms which none can misunderstand and on evidence which none can "fake":

> 17,185 persons (equivalent to 31.1 per cent of the working-class population, and to 17.8 per cent of the population of York) are living below the minimum. Included in this total are 5,776 children under the age of 14. These represent 43 per cent of the children under 14 included in our schedules, and 28.2 per cent of the children under 14 in the city.

What are the causes of poverty? They are these: low wages, 32.8 per cent, affecting 5,643 people; unemployment, 28.6 per cent, 4,909 people; and old age, 14.7 per cent, 2,521 people. It is significant that inadequate wages account for a greater proportion of poverty than does unemployment: and it is pitiable that so many people should be poor just because they are old.

Of the unemployed men 76 per cent are "fit and capable and looking eagerly for work". "Almost one half of the unemployed are under 40 years old and nearly two-thirds under 50". "The relief given is not sufficient to raise the recipient above the minimum". It is a sad conclusion that unemployment has seriously increased since the last survey in 1889. Says Mr. Rowntree:

> The tenfold increase in the poverty due to unemployment is a matter for grave concern.

The minimum wage is fixed by Mr. Rowntree at 53s. a week (pre-war standards), together with an allowance of 5s. a week for each dependent child. This would lift all the workers out of poverty, though it would not raise them very far above the poverty line.

The result of this grinding poverty is registered in the devastating ravages of malnutrition and under-nourishment.

> A disturbingly large proportion of the working-class families in York are not getting enough to eat to keep them in health, and this is due not to lack of knowledge, but to lack of means.

Every family living on unemployment benefit is under-nourished. Their dietary falls short of the standard requirement in every constituent vitamin except one. The death-rate of those living below the poverty line is 60 per cent higher than in the case of the more favoured classes:

> This gives a measure of the price in lives lost which the poor pay because of their poverty.

The tragedy falls most severely on the children; and the still greater tragedy is that the evil consequences of malnutrition pur-

sue them through the greater part of their lives. Not only is it true that

> 52.5 per cent of the children under one year of age, 49.7 per cent of those over one and under five, and 39.1 per cent of those over five and under fifteen are living below the minimum,

and that infant mortality is almost twice as great in the case of those families that have to live below the poverty line as in the case of those above it, but, what is even more distressing,

> there is not one of these children whose physique will not be permanently injured through the privation they have to undergo during the most critical years of life.

The whole argument of the book is buttressed by hundreds of poignant stories taken from the notes of the investigators. If an excerpt of these stories could be made and presented in the pages of a *Penguin* or *Pelican,* it would make fascinating, even if somewhat disconcerting, reading.

The conclusion of the whole matter is given in these sober, simple and restrained words:

> Great though the progress made during the last forty years has been, there is no cause for satisfaction in the fact that in a country so rich as England over 30 per cent of the workers in a typical provincial city should have incomes so small that it is beyond their means to live even at the stringently economical level adopted as a minimum in this survey, nor in the fact that almost half the children of working-class parents spend the first five years of their life in poverty and that almost a third of them live below the poverty line for ten years or more.

The book terminates with a modern and up-to-date reference which should not escape the attention of those who would relate this matter of poverty to the issues of the present-day struggle:

> Everywhere democracy is challenged. A totalitarian state does not demand high intellectual or spiritual standards from its people; on the contrary it can only function successfully when they cease to think for themselves and are willing to obey the command to worship false gods. But a democratic state can only flourish if the level of intelligence of the community is high and its spiritual life dynamic.

The second publication to which we turn for instruction is a remarkable little book written by Dr. David M. Goodfellow, Extra-Mural Lecturer in the University of Durham, with an introduction by Prof. R. H. Tawney and a preface by Mr. David Adams, M.P. It is entitled *Tyneside, The Social Facts,* and costs only a shilling. It is crammed with information. The manner in which the book was put together is worthy of note and imitation. It was the result of a session's work by tutorial classes organized by the Workers' Educational Association in Newcastle-on-Tyne and Felling-on-

Tyne. It examines the bad patches for which Tyneside has become notorious. Its method is to take the three main tragedies in the worker's life, track them to their source, and supply a suggestion for radical treatment. The three tragedies are tuberculosis, infant mortality, and malnutrition. As an indication of Tyneside's distress, it is sufficient to say that in October, 1938, the figures of the Unemployment Assistance Board were twice as bad as in the poorest borough of London.

Tuberculosis is more pernicious in Tyneside than anywhere else in England:

> Whereas the older industrial areas are 23 per cent worse in this respect than the London area, Tyneside is 72 per cent worse.

The main cause of tuberculosis is overcrowding.

> An overcrowded house, even though it is relatively clean, dry, and well ventilated, is still the main danger.

The record is much the same for infant mortality. Tyneside sank very low during the inter-war period as compared with other industrial areas of Britain. Once again the main cause was overcrowding. In 1933 one in every five of the babies of Tyneside was born in a one-roomed home. In 1938 only one baby in twenty suffered this fate. "It leaves us with nothing to be satisfied about", says Dr. Goodfellow:

> It means that when this present war is over we shall once again have to devote all our energies to the improvement of social conditions.

The record of malnutrition continues the sorry tale. Despite increased employment on a rearmament programme malnutrition was worse in 1938 than in 1935:

> The percentage of under-nourished schoolchildren is more than three times as high in Tyneside and Durham as it is in London and the South.

The way out of this terrible impasse is said to be a system of regional and territorial planning on a large, comprehensive, and fundamental scale:

> Such a regional authority would be able to speak with one voice as regards the industrial development and planning of the north-eastern region, its equitable treatment by the national exchequer, and the uniform development of its social services on the lines required by both industrial and agricultural districts.

Mr. Rowntree's work merely cites the social facts and states them with meticulous care and abundant evidence. But it does not attempt a solution of the problem. That is not its business. It takes for granted that other minds will probe the evil if only they

will honestly face the facts. Dr. Goodfellow's pamphlet leads to a strong recommendation concerning saner and ampler planning.

The third publication goes much farther. It professes to solve the problem. It is entitled *Towards a Christian Britain: Social Justice and Economic Reconstruction*. This is a "Statement by the Commission of the Churches for International Friendship and Social Responsibility" (S.C.M., 4d.).

Let it be said at once that here is the most significant pronouncement on social justice made by the Churches in this century or probably in any of the nearer centuries—and that is saying a great deal of a period which produced the Copec volumes. Within the compass of only thirty pages it contains a massive piece of Christian thinking. If there be such a group as a Christian Brains Trust then surely such an amalgamation of intelligence has been at the disposal of the Churches' Commission in the formulation of this Report. It is as ripe and fruity a piece of economic thinking as one could find anywhere, even among the professional economists. The statement should be put immediately into the hands of every church office-bearer and every church member. The young men and women of our churches especially should be invited to give it clear and earnest study in their several groups and register their findings.

The Report has glaring gaps and serious imperfections. Rather than engage in any public castigation, however, it would seem to be better that one should accept the courteous suggestion of the authors and submit one's criticisms to the Central Office as a contribution to some future and better shaping. From a brief analysis of the Report the reader may discern its excellences and gain a glimpse of its defects.

The kernel of the statement consists in a three-fold charter. The Charter for the Individual is designed "to enable every citizen to play a responsible part in the life of the community". It contains this important provision:

> Every man should have the opportunity of a decent house, a healthy childhood, an education suited to his abilities, and a chance to develop and express his social and spiritual nature —in work, in leisure, and in retirement—to a degree according with the wealth-producing capacity of his day.

The Charter for Industry is designed

> to enable industry to be directed toward the maximum service of the community rather than determined primarily by the index of financial profit for its several units.

The Charter for World Economy contains these important provisions:

> Every nation and community should be safeguarded against forms of trading which involve their economic exploi-

> tation. . . . The right of access to the raw materials of the world should be assured on equal terms to all nations and communities which duly respect the rights of others in their commercial and political activities.

The Three-fold Charter is preceded by a statement of the foundation principles of the new order of society, and shows how any approach to Christian reconstruction must start with the cardinal affirmations of the Christian faith. The Charter is succeeded by a picture of the kind of better Britain we seek. It goes on to make a *résumé* of immediate objectives, comprising the fields of home and family, education, agriculture and rural life, unemployment, international trade, and finance. The concluding section deals with the responsibilities of Christian citizens, and is not afraid to envisage the ultimate need and use of political action.

The whole statement is alive with penetrating, radical, and sometimes caustic and biting aphorisms:

> It is unjust that changes which bring benefit to a whole industry should spell disaster to any who have served it.
>
> Financial transactions which artificially disturb the exchange rates between nations should be regarded as sheer piracy.
>
> The just demand for a "living wage" will never again be ruled out of court on the plea that this may be more than the industry can bear.
>
> The nation will no longer allow the rights of its citizens to be jeopardized by anti-social forms of private enterprise.
>
> The social injustice of creating a cultured *élite* without giving to the great majority of the nation's youth a rightful share in our cultural heritage should cease at once.

Indeed, all readers should steep themselves in the contents of pages 19 to 25, and it is hoped that among such readers will be most of our "Christian" captains of industry. The statement concludes with a healthy and compelling apologia summoning Christian people to that vision, energy, sacrifice, and renewal of faith without which

> there is no security against the bedevilment and disillusion which dog men's efforts to save themselves apart from God.

The present writer is not a scientific economist, nor has he been able to make a study of the literature, research, and textbooks of economics. But he has lived and worked for the best part of eighteen years in the East End of London. He has been in almost daily contact with the hardest-hit of the workers of England. He has done much quiet, unofficial observing, and a fair share of honest thinking. Here are his conclusions, garnered from a lifetime of independent study, and from these conclusions he is not likely now to resile:

(1) The irreducible minimum must be the abolition of poverty and unemployment. Of these two the first will be the harder to eliminate. For it is more than likely that the end of the war will leave the entire nation very poor indeed. That will not matter, however, so long as its citizens agree to be poor together. The position will be intolerable if any one man is rich so long as any other brother is preventably poor. The method of Christian action is at any rate quite clear. No Christian man will be content to be well-to-do while another fellow-citizen is living on or below the poverty line. If the whole nation is to be poor after the war, then let there at least be a communalism of poverty.

The problem of unemployment is much more easy of solution. There is work for everybody to do who can do it, and there always has been this wealth of work. It never was true of this country that there were too many workers for the jobs to be done. The truth lies in exactly the opposite direction. There has always been too much work for the available supply of workers. Let the nation embark on a great constructive scheme of post-war building in every direction and set aside the money necessary to finance this scheme, and every employable man could find work, and in a decade the fruits of industry would begin to repay the initial expenditure many times over.

When the writer has on several occasions urged that the government be asked to set apart the few hundred million pounds necessary to engage the services of all our unemployed in constructive work over a given period he has been met by the contention that his figures were "astronomical". That blessed word "astronomical", like its counterpart "Mesopotamia", has been the shield and protection of the religious die-hard in all generations. The present conflict has badly upset the arguments of these statistical astronomers. For if war can mobilize thousands of millions of pounds for the purposes of world-wide destruction, shall not peace be able to assemble the few hundred millions needful for the creation of a better Britain?

(2) The system called Capitalism must go. It has had its day and it must cease to be. It should be gathered to its fathers, by the Will of God. No doubt it played its part in the historic development of industrial Britain. But it has long outstayed its welcome. It must give place, and that immediately, to a system of co-operation.

For capitalism is the main cause of poverty and unemployment. To say this, of course, is not to denounce or renounce capital. That would be folly. The contention is that capital should be in the control of the community and not at the mercy of private enterprise. Nor is this to be read as a wholesale condemnation of the

capitalist. That would be unkind and untrue. In any case, it would be an invitation to suicide, for we all stand in the same condemnation in virtue of those capital gifts with which nature has provided each one of us. But it does mean that a system which is based on the profit motive and on so-called "enlightened self-interest" can no longer be expected to subserve the highest claims of the ordinary men and women who are the citizens of the land.

For example, capitalism requires for its maintenance that there be a permanent pool of unemployment by means of which it may recruit labour and stabilize wages. This again does not mean that wicked men called capitalists have definitely and deliberately decided on an unemployment policy. That would be a cruel slander. But it does mean that a system such as capitalism tends almost unconsciously toward the creation of such a state of affairs. For it is a subtle psychological law that such a seemingly soulless thing as a system takes on the colour and intelligence of the human forces that operate it. If unemployment is to cease its source in capitalism must be distrained.

(3) There is no such thing as a fixed, inexorable, and inevitable economic law which must be followed and obeyed almost *willy-nilly*. It is generally argued that the problems of modern civilization are too complex for the jejune mind of the layman or the pastor. Now the alleged complexity of modern social life is largely a myth designed to perpetuate the power of the capitalist expert. If there be complexity in the modern economic situation that is because such complexity has been consciously introduced by the mind of man. At significant periods in industrial history significant action was taken by the leaders and captains of industry, and there you have the origin of man-made complexity. What the human mind has contrived the human mind can undo. The issue is essentially simple—simple as the moral law.

(4) The ultimate solution of the social problem and the ultimate achievement of social justice lies in the hands and hearts of the Christian Society. Only the Christian Society fully surrendered to the doing of the Will of God can possibly move in the right direction and finally reach the promised land. Only a miracle can save the situation, and only God's Spirit can provide that miracle. The solution is with Him, not with us. But He must use us in reaching that solution.

By the Christian Society is not necessarily meant, of course, the institution known as the Church. It consists rather of groups of Christian people, linked up where possible, deeply and definitely given to the discovery and doing of the Holy Will. Because of our intellectual and moral limitations we must needs lay down a programme, propose a policy, and formulate a scheme. But the

final and perfect shape of the Kingdom of God on earth no faith can formulate and no imagination foresee. An attempted "blueprint" of the Kingdom may turn out to be a gesture of unbelief. The divine force moves through His children and His creative energy makes all things new.

Let us meet together. Let us pray together. Let us think together. Let us surrender together. Let us be willing to make every sacrifice that the human tragedy demands, the sacrifice of life itself. Nothing then can prevent the divine power from operating in and through us, and creating not only a better order but a new order of beauty, love, goodness, and truth. The grand strategy of the Gospel prevails, and nothing can stand against it. The practice and proclamation of love, forgiveness, and self-giving to the uttermost — that is the real politic beside which earthly management is as dust and ashes. When that has become our divine habit, no power on earth can stand against its impact. "Prepare ye the way of the Lord". When we have made the preparation of ourselves, and brought into that preparation all the resources of heart, mind, and will, then the world will have been won for Christ, because Christ, through us, will have won the world for Himself.

We strongly recommend ministers to read the Rev. Arthur W. Hopkinson's **Parson's Progress* (Joseph, 10s. 6d.), though we know that many of them will disagree with his views on Church, Ministry, and Sacraments. Mr. Hopkinson has peculiar ideas about Milton, and his autobiography does not gain by being written backwards, but the serious and responsible way in which he regards "the cure of souls" cannot but be a challenge to all called to that high office. Mr. Hopkinson has served in widely differing parishes—a London suburb and a country village, Nottingham and Bournemouth, and now he has retired to an assistant curacy in Dorset. On this varied experience is based some wise counsel from which all could benefit. It is interesting to learn of Mr. Hopkinson's Independent background, and Manchester Congregationalists will find certain references of interest.

Miss Mary Carbery's *Happy World* (Longmans, 12s. 6d.) is "The Story of a Victorian Childhood". Begun when the writer was twelve, this autobiography has been re-told, but it retains all the child's attitudes to life—its fears, imaginings, romance, interest in life's beginning and end—as well as glimpses of Gladstone, Disraeli, and Acton. It is certain that these pages will give the reader many pleasant hours, with not a few chuckles; once the book is begun it is not easy to put it down.

THE PRESENT THEOLOGICAL CLEAVAGE IN CONGREGATIONALISM

By the Rev. C. J. Cadoux, M.A., D.D., D.Litt.

It is widely known that there is at present a serious theological cleavage in our Congregational ranks. It is not necessary, perhaps not desirable, to mention any names in this connexion; nor is there any need for the moment to describe the cleavage. Both names and issues are already sufficiently familiar to most of us. I propose to refer to the two sides as "traditionalist" and "liberal" respectively—but I use the terms simply as designations, and without prejudice. The rift has been deepening during recent years, and has now reached very serious proportions. Other Christian denominations besides ourselves are affected by analogous controversies; but confining ourselves for the time being to Congregationalism we cannot doubt that, valuable as variety of view often is as a sign of life and health, it is a bad thing for us to allow a serious doctrinal divergence to rot in our denominational bowels, to generate animosity, to alienate us from one another, and so to impair our religious witness and influence.

It seems therefore obvious that the situation calls for the frankest and most-thorough discussion, conducted of course in a brotherly and charitable spirit, but extending to the really-fundamental issues, out of which our actual disagreements arise. There has, I venture to suggest, been far too little of this serious effort to understand each other's point of view, to put all our cards on the table, and to reason the matter out patiently and quietly between ourselves. We have had plenty of rhetoric and emotion, strong language, false antitheses, exaggerated caricatures, violent denunciations, scornful innuendos, and damaging but quite question-begging labels. The fallacious arguments *ad terrorem* and *ad verecundiam* have been sadly overworked. It is time now that we got together and tried to explain ourselves calmly to one another, with a willingness to change our minds if the commanding authority of truth newly seen requires us to do so. "If truth do anywhere manifest itself", wrote the judicious Hooker to the Puritans of his time, "seek not to smother it with glozing delusion, acknowledge the greatness thereof, and think it your best victory, when the same doth prevail over you".

It is, then, as an endeavour to clarify the issues dividing us that I have written this article. Both sides admit (as all men in honest controversy must admit) that there does exist an

objective truth regarding the matters in dispute, and that it is the sincere and avowed purpose of both to bring their thoughts into as close a correspondence with that truth as is possible for them.

I would then begin by requesting serious attention to a distinction of great importance for all theological thought—I mean the distinction between the foundation-realities on the one hand, and the resultant doctrines involved in and implied by them on the other. The difference between these two lies in the fact that the former are directly rooted in man's religious consciousness and experience, whereas the latter are the fruit of his subsequent reflection on this consciousness and experience. No doubt, on the borders, the groups shade off into one another: but the broad distinction between them is surely clear. It is indeed already widely recognized, if only in a vague way. We contrast religion with theology; we speak of kernel and husk, of substance and form, of things essential and things optional. A lately-deceased leader in our midst used the terms "idea" and "conception" for the kernel and the husk respectively: these terms are perhaps not very happily chosen, because, as words, a clear difference between their meaning is not at first sight apparent. Another recent writer uses the word "dogma" for the unchanging Gospel, as over against the changing philosophical terms in which this central "substance" is expressed. "Dogma" is, I suggest, not a good word for the purpose, because it is customarily used to denote conclusions authoritatively formulated. But the important thing is that the distinction is clearly acknowledged, even by our traditionalist friends.

Now if we are to derive any help from our common recognition of this difference, we shall need to keep before our minds what the ground of the difference is. The foundation-realities are *directly rooted* in our moral and religious consciousness and experience. We have indeed to use words to describe them, while realizing that —owing to what Wordsworth calls "the sad incompetence of human speech"—words are but a clumsy means of expressing what we mean. But with this proviso we can say that our trust in the existence, infinitude, and perfect goodness of God, our acknowledgment of Jesus Christ as "Lord" and our experience of His power as Saviour to bring us to God, our realization of the duty and value of prayer, our sense of the spiritual worth of the Scriptures, and our submission to the moral law as at one and the same time the Will of God and our own lasting peace—all such things as these are foundation-realities of our consciousness and experience as Christians; they are, as it were, the data from which we are bound to start, because our acceptance of them, though we can subsequently vindicate it by intellectual reflection and argu-

ment, rests in every case on something still deeper—the instinctive and axiomatic utterances of the human heart face to face with itself and the Universe.

Over against these foundation-realities are the theories to which the human mind has been led, when it has followed its natural bent to build, on the foundation of its experience and its innate convictions, a version of the facts which shall be intellectually satisfying. To this class will belong such beliefs as the pre-existence of Christ, his coming as "the second man from heaven" (*I Cor.* 15^{47}) or as the incarnation of the Divine Logos (*John* 1^{14}), his death as an atoning sacrifice, the Triune nature of the Deity, the existence of the Devil, the inerrancy of Scripture, the special revelation of truth to man by God—in short, most of the particular clauses of the historic Creeds. I am not at the moment expressing any opinion or passing any judgment about the truth of any of these doctrines: I am only asking you to admit that none of them is a basic "experience" of man or is *directly rooted* in such experience, but that they one and all arise as a result of man's intellectual endeavour to state what is implied by his experience for his thoughts concerning God and the Universe.

Now let it be candidly agreed that all such doctrines as these, which have played a large part in the serious thinking of pious men, are entitled to our genuine and sympathetic reverence. Nothing could be more unjustifiable than an attitude of Philistine superiority towards them. More than that, they include beliefs which for all we know are likely to vindicate themselves as true to the strongest Christian intellects for ever. Yet it has to be insisted on in the interests of truth that in no case are these formulated doctrines — not even the most ancient of them — sacrosanct, inviolable, and infallible: and for the following reason. Despite the objective constancy of the real, and despite the broad uniformity of mental processes, an element of subjectivity necessarily enters into all our intellectual constructions. This subjective or personal element always operates in a limiting, and sometimes in a perverting way: and as it is something different for every man, no human theory, however widely acceptable, is ever entitled to be treated as *inherently or unconditionally final.* It is well known that the subjective element in human thinking was very largely neglected in ancient times, and that many are disinclined to reckon with it even today: to make room for it seems to them too often to be perilously like surrendering or betraying their treasured convictions. Yet, when attention is drawn to it, we really have no option but to recognize both the fact itself and what it inevitably implies.

Now, as I understand the Liberal Protestant position, its cardinal principle is an assertion of the liberty of the Christian mind to sift, abandon, and reformulate the traditional Christian

doctrines, according as its knowledge of the relevant facts and its grasp of truth expand, and to do so unhindered by the antiquity of the doctrines or concepts in question, and undeterred even by the fears of those who are unwilling to abandon or alter them in any respect. This, of course, does not mean that whatever step Liberals have taken in this way in the past has necessarily been right; still less, of course, does it mean that the traditional doctrines as a group may be discarded or slightingly spoken of. But it does mean that, as against the clear leading of truth, no appeal to the consensus of our Christian predecessors in the matter of formulated doctrine, and no complaint about "whittling down" or "watering down" our Christian heritage of beliefs, is admissible.

When Liberals emphasize their supreme concern for truth as the only orthodoxy deserving the name, they are often rebuked by their traditionalist brethren for claiming without warrant a monopoly of the love of truth. This love, it is urged, is just as real a concern of the traditionalists themselves as it is of the Liberals. Now it would be improper to call in question the sincerity of any man's profession of a real love for truth. But it needs to be pointed out that a man making such a profession is under obligation to produce, in defence of any belief of his which is challenged, some deeper ground than that this belief has been widely held for a very long time. When Dr. Orchard wrote the fourth volume of his *Foundations of Faith,* he kept quoting what he called "Catholic theology", by which he meant the general opinions of the medieval Schoolmen, as if it were a sort of *ne-plus-ultra* version of truth on which we could build as on an unchallengeable basis. But — to come nearer home — one frequently finds present-day Congregational conservatives appealing in broad general terms to "Christian doctrine" as a sort of final court of appeal, despite the utterly vague and unanalysed connotation of the term. Sometimes the argument is couched in the form of an impressive appeal to the agreement of certain great Christians of differing schools on some point of doctrine which the speaker himself desires to retain and to vindicate as orthodox. At one point the selection may be Cowper, Doddridge, Bonaventura, and Aquinas; at another, Aquinas, Calvin, Baxter, Chalmers, and Charles Gore. But, impressive as such appeals are bound to be, their entire inconclusiveness ought to be apparent. It would not be difficult to put forward equally or even more imposing collections of names in vindication of belief in eternal punishment, of belief in the justice of burning witches, and of belief in the inerrancy of the Bible. The truth or otherwise of the particular doctrine concerned is not at the moment our question: our question is whether arguments of the kind I have quoted are valid, or are even really consistent with a profession of loyalty to truth at all costs, unless they are advanced

as the purely-incidental accompaniments of more fundamental considerations. Our virtually-unanimous abandonment of belief in Biblical inerrancy (one example only among several) ought to suffice to convince us that long-lived Christian unanimity, prevailing throughout even as much as nearly eighteen centuries, is of itself no guarantee of tenability as against the clear leading of the Spirit of truth in our own day.

It must be further insisted that even the New Testament itself —that revealing and invaluable deposit of the life and thought of those who first experienced redemption through Christ—contains a number of doctrinal concepts easily distinguishable from the basic witness of the redeemed soul. Hence it is illegitimate to try to block the constructions of the modern theologian by a simple appeal to the undifferentiated authority of "the New Testament", as if its writers were all of one mind on matters of doctrine, and were as Biblical authors infallible, and as if there were no difference to be drawn between the reality of their religious experience and the soundness of their doctrinal speculations. In regard to what I have called the foundation-realities, the New-Testament witness is indeed not only a uniform witness, but is the great historical sheet-anchor of our Christian discipleship. But on *doctrinal matters* it is neither final, nor even self-consistent. It contains, for instance, at least two quite distinct Christologies (that of the Synoptics, Acts, and I Peter on the one hand, and that of Paul and John on the other), and at least two eschatologies (the Synoptic and the Johannine—the former of which has had to be abandoned, because the lapse of time has proved it to have been mistaken). If we wish to quote "the New Testament" in support of a theological doctrine, whether by appealing to it as a whole, or by referring to some individual text, we ought in all seriousness to go further and show that the doctrine in question really was involved in the basic facts of history and experience to which the New Testament bears witness.

If this line of argument should seem to any to be unduly negative, and to involve all our Christian beliefs in uncertainty, I would observe that that impression rests on a misunderstanding. The things that matter most are what I have called the foundation-realities; and as regards these, both traditionalists and liberals stand together shoulder to shoulder against the godless paganism of the world. This fundamental unity of the two wings must never be overlooked amid the controversies that divide us. At the same time, these controversies cry out loudly for attention and settlement. That is why I have laboured the theological freedom of the modern Christian. It is, as I see it, the real point of principle which is at issue between us. No doubt the liberal position has its dangers, as indeed every good thing in life has. But we are not

without compensating safeguards. In the existence and goodness of God, the character of the Universe He has created, the constancy and goodness of His dealings with men, the recorded facts of history, and man's incurable love for truth, we have the guarantee, not that we shall be immune from error, but that we shall with God's help be able to discover and correct our errors. To suppose that one can protect oneself or the Church from grievous heresy by enthroning a select group of doctrinal conclusions as sacrosanct and unalterable, is to betray a lack of trust in the power or willingness of the Spirit of God to lead us. It is to use a method which would not be tolerated for a moment in any other branch of serious enquiry, such, for example, as that concerned with physical nature. Both in the one department and in the other, the facts as they are, plus the investigator's genuine love of truth, are amply sufficient as a protection against final or fatal error.

Having thus vindicated to the best of my ability what I regard as the foundation-principle of Liberal theology, I should like to offer by way of illustration a few comments on one or two selected doctrines.

We are hearing a good deal today from our traditionalist brethren about the greatness of John Calvin. Papers are written and read in his "defence": we are reminded that we are "sons of Geneva": praise is bestowed upon his high-churchmanship, his wonderful realization of the sovereignty of God, his repudiation of all human self-righteousness, his massive erudition, his power of systematic thought, and so forth. Calvinistic congresses have been held: Calvinistic catch-words resound in our midst: Karl Barth and writers of his school are busy over what might well be described as a revival of Calvinism. Now it is one thing to honour Calvin as a keen Christian, a powerful thinker, and an influential Church-leader, and to recognize that his writings contain many precious truths: but it is quite another thing to accord to him and his characteristic system indiscriminating praise in general terms and to call for a revival of "Calvinism". The *distinguishing mark* of Calvin's theological system was the sovereignty of God, and that understood as involving His sole causality as regards the salvation or reprobation of men. All men, Calvin urged, had incurred condemnation; but God was pleased, by means of a Divine decree, to predestine certain individuals to salvation, *i.e.*, to "elect" them out of the general mass to be the recipients of His saving grace, leaving the rest of mankind to suffer eternal punishment. That, put in the soberest possible terms, was not only an inseparable feature of Calvinism, but its most characteristic feature. We are reminded in its defence that it had been taught

by the great Augustine and was even held by the Apostle Paul before him, and that Divine election is certainly taught in Scripture.

I would observe in reply that its alleged Scriptural basis goes back through the Old Testament to the characteristic Semitic tendency to ascribe all things, good and bad alike, to the direct volition of God—a tendency which cannot be harmonized with what we now know concerning the freedom and responsibility of man. If man is a person at all and not a marionette, his needful reliance upon Divine grace must rest ultimately on his own independent will, not on some inscrutable selective decree of God. Nor does the doctrine fare any better when we scrutinize its claim to rest on man's experience of God's redeeming grace. To admit that without such grace man cannot be saved is not to say, or imply, that God Himself decides who is to receive that grace and who not. The drowning man dependent on the life-belt for salvation must himself at least grasp it. The starving beggar dependent on the almsgiver must at least decide for himself whether or not he will raise the food to his lips.

But a still-more fatal count against the doctrine is that it traverses the sovereign truth of God's goodness. It directly contradicts our Lord's revelation of God's character as that of a loving Father, who therefore "willeth that all men should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth". What human father would not put forth all his efforts to save and help a child in danger of perishing, even though the danger was caused through the child's own wilful disobedience? And shall we ascribe to God, on the ground of "sovereignty" forsooth, a stern and icy willingness to let numbers of His children perish everlastingly, because He does not see fit to include them among the favoured few whom He plucks as brands from the burning? Surely, if ever there was a grave and dangerous heresy, we have one here. Why not then frankly say so? No one hesitates to expose without mercy the shameful heresies of Arius and Pelagius: why this extreme and one-sided tenderness over those of Augustine and Calvin?

Truth to tell, most of our modern encomiasts of Calvin do not themselves actually accept this cardinal doctrine of his. They try to pass it by in silence, or wave it airily aside as no real essential of the great master's system as a whole. When pressed to explain themselves, they usually say that, in professing acceptance of the doctrines of predestination and election, what they *really* mean is their belief that man cannot save himself by his own unaided efforts, but that he is dependent on the unmerited grace of God. But that belief is not characteristic of Calvinism: it would be as cheerfully accepted by the semi-Pelagian and the Arminian as it is by the Calvinist. It seems to me at the least gravely misleading,

if not a trifle disingenuous (though doubtless unintentionally so), to profess general belief in a system and its doctrines, when one is all the time accepting them only in a form which their creator would have hotly repudiated, and which could be readily accepted by his strongest opponents.

In regard to the important doctrine of the Atonement, the Liberal Protestant pleads for a drastic reformulation. In doing this he is *in principle* doing nothing more than the great Anselm did, when he repudiated the long-sanctioned theory of a ransom paid to Satan, not because it lacked patristic or even scriptural support (which it did not), but because *he personally held* that it was dishonouring to God. The Liberal would urge that the ultimate category under which the relations between God and man must be viewed is the category of a personal relationship, and that it is only in the light of this that the judicial or commercial or mechanical aspect of God's dealings with us can rightly be viewed. With this approach, sin is seen to be essentially the rupture or prevention of personal communion or fellowship with God, and forgiveness essentially the removal of such prevention or the healing of such rupture. But if so, then the main category under which we are bound to view the work of Christ in effecting that forgiveness is that of personal reconciliation, the personal change in the sinner's heart, his personal approach to God in penitence, and God's personal welcome to the returning Prodigal. Doubtless we can use other categories, such as those of propitiatory sacrifice, legal satisfaction, or cosmic victory over Satan, as alternative means of expression of a metaphorical, poetical, or devotional kind. But if so, we ought to make it clear that we *are* using them only as alternatives, *i.e.*, in a strictly subordinate and illustrative way. If we employ such categories as serious doctrinal explanations, after it has been pointed out that the real root of the matter is something quite different, then we are darkening counsel, causing the little ones to stumble, and giving occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme. And this is just what our traditionalist friends so often seem to be bent on doing. They prefer a non-ethical, transactional, ritual, legal, or even a military metaphor in order to set forth the redeeming work of God in Christ, instead of putting in the centre that in it which is truly central—the moral character of Christ's self-sacrifice and the change it actually effects in the personal relations between ourselves and God. They prefer to speak of God's "mighty acts", and of His victory over a mythological personage like the devil or a metaphysical entity like "sin and death", rather than of His personally reconciling and self-sacrificing love.

The last topic I select for comment in this discussion is the claim of sober history in our thoughts concerning Christ Himself. Never will I allow my traditionalist friends to forget the great words of R. C. Moberly in *Lux Mundi:* "Councils, we admit, and Creeds, cannot go behind, but must wholly rest upon the history of our Lord Jesus Christ". When we turn to that history, we find one who is admittedly unique, who claimed to be the rightful Lord of men, and whose Divine greatness was such as still to hold us in grateful thraldom. His own achieved goodness begets in us faith in such a God as He preached: clearly God was in Him reconciling the world unto Himself; and as the author and perfecter of our faith, He has become the first-born among many brothers. This Lordship of His necessarily raises ulterior theological problems; but it does not follow that all that Christians have said and thought about Him in their desire to honour Him has been accurately or tenably said. Even in the New Testament some things are affirmed of Him which the truth of history will not allow us to accept—I instance the Virgin Birth and the Nature-Miracles (especially as these are narrated in the Gospel of Matthew). Some of the doctrines for which traditionalists claim His authority rest on a very insufficient historical basis. To found a theory of the Atonement, for instance, on the Cry of Dereliction from the Cross is to overstrain the evidence; for we know for certain neither the language in which the words were spoken, nor the precise content of the utterance, nor its meaning. Support has been sought in Jesus' teaching for the morbid view that all our righteousness is as filthy rags, tainted with pride and self-complacency, and that the Gospels rule out all notions of reward. Not only do I not find these ideas in the Gospels, not even in the Parables of the Labourers in the Vineyard and of the Pharisee and the Tax-Collector in the Temple, which are supposed to express them; but I find a great deal that is inconsistent with them—in Jesus' own passionate insistence on the vital need of obedience to His ethical and religious teaching (*e.g.*, *Mt.* $7^{24\text{-}27}$) and in His frequent allusions to the reward (μισθός, lit. "wages") which was in store for those who did so. Our traditionalist friends, adopting the language of Calvin, regularly reckon as one of the marks of the true Church "the administration of the Sacraments as instituted by Christ": yet it must be observed that it is historically very dubious whether Jesus instituted any sacraments. We cannot be sure that He gave any explicit injunctions regarding the practice of Baptism or the repetition of the Supper, since *Mk.* 16^{16} and *Mt.* 28^{19} cannot be regarded as containing actual sayings of Jesus, and the words "Do this in remembrance of me" are found only in Paul and not in the Gospels. Not only is scant respect paid by traditionalists to the recorded history of Jesus; but their theological interpretations of

His Person are also at variance with it. What sense, for instance, can we seriously attach to the plea that, whereas the Prophets *proclaimed* the Word of God, Jesus *was and is* the Word of God? Examine the language closely; allow for its metaphorical character; and the sense of it—except as an awkwardly-worded recognition of Jesus' uniqueness—vanishes into thin air. The Chalcedonian Formula of 451 A.D. is generally recognized as implying that Jesus' human nature was impersonal, and that He was therefore not really a human person at all; and this conclusion some Congregational traditionalists appear to be willing to accept. Yet how is it to be reconciled with the plain testimony of the Synoptic Gospels?

But I have said enough to illustrate and vindicate the principle for which I believe Liberal Protestantism stands. I must not enlarge further on its application to the meaning of Christ's resurrection, to the problem of human sin, and to questions of progress, evolution, and the future life. I would not have it supposed that I imagine Liberalism to be able to clear up with a few easy strokes of the pen all the difficulties and mysteries attending these and most other questions of Christian theology. But I do contend that the mind of the reverent and thoughtful disciple of Christ is as free today to follow out fearlessly the leadings of the Spirit of Truth as ever the Fathers, Apostles, and Saints were in the days gone by—nay, that they are under obligation to do so as part of their ministry. Well might we say of modern Liberal theologians what the author of the Epistle to Diognetos said of the early Christians generally: "To so great a task as this has God appointed them; and it is not lawful for them to decline it".

It was perhaps unfortunate that we read Mr. Hugh Ross Williamson's "Author's Note" to *Captain Thomas Schofield* (Collins, 9d. 6d.) before reading the story itself. Otherwise we might have enjoyed this historical novel, though deeming it too didactic and suggesting that a course of Henty would be good for the author. In the Note, Mr. Williamson describes himself as a "professional historian", patronizes Gardiner, and calls some of Firth's work, whose knowledge of the Commonwealth period it was impossible for any man to fathom, "painfully inadequate". Had Mr. Williamson been trained by Firth, this novel would have escaped some of its own inadequacies, including the prejudices and the carelessness which leads to misprints, to take 50 pp. only, on pp. 191, 196, 230, 231. Let us, please, have either history or fiction, and not some pretentious mongrel which is neither the one nor the other.

Another historical novel is Miss Lucie Street's *His Excellency William Penn* (Cassell, 9s. 6d.), which, perhaps just because it is less presumptuous than Mr. Williamson's, we found more enjoyable. In her Preface Miss Street admits her departure from history, and at times she has given her imagination full scope.

ARE THE CHURCHES UNSOCIABLE?

By James Gauld.

The minister of a church I once attended visited a family which had settled in his district, and was received rather coldly. "When we first came here", said the lady of the house, "we attended your church regularly for the first three months, but nobody took any notice of us so we stopped going".

Now I have no patience with such people. In most of our churches strangers or visitors appear every Sunday, and they may be there for that day only. They are usually welcomed by a deacon, given a hymnbook, and conducted to a seat. Besides a sermon, the singing, and the opportunity for worship, they enjoy the amenities of the church, a cushioned seat, lighting and heating, and then, after contributing a few coppers, or even a sixpence, to the collection, they walk out at the close without looking at anybody, and hurry away nursing a sense of grievance. What more do they expect for their money? They would get nothing like so much in mere entertainment anywhere else at the price.

When an individual—and the same applies to a family—moves into a new town or district, and has decided which church he would like to attend, he ought to remember that he wishes to join a company of worshippers which is already more or less self-contained. He is a stranger to them and, while they will be quite pleased that he proposes to fill a seat in one of their all too frequently empty pews, it will take them a little time to make his acquaintance properly. They may think him to be only a casual visitor at first, and beyond a smiling "Good morning" from an official or two, he cannot expect any fuss to be made of him before they know if he intends to become a regular member of the congregation.

His first step, therefore, if he is already a church member, is to apply for his transfer to the new church. The minister or a deacon will then visit him to get to know something about him, and he will be received at the next church meeting. That will give him a start, probably several people will speak to him, and there and then invite him to come to meetings connected with the week-night activities of the church.

If, however, he is of a retiring nature, and does not respond cordially to their overtures, he may find it ends there. It takes two to be sociable, and the stranger must realize that he is pushing his way into an already established and complete little society. However useful or important a personage he may eventually become in that church, the members know nothing about him at first, and

hitherto the work has been going on quite smoothly without his assistance.

Should he be young and shy, he may find himself too diffident to force his way in, and blessed is he if he hits on a church with an understanding minister. May I illustrate what I mean by narrating my own experience in that respect?

At the age of nineteen I left home and went to Manchester. Through the kindness of a colleague I got settled in the suburb of Chorlton-cum-Hardy, and on my first Sunday there he took me to the Macfadyen Memorial Church. The Rev. David Walters, afterwards Moderator for Wales, was then in his first English charge, and after the service my friend waited behind to introduce me to that genial giant. I was a mere nobody, just a raw youth a long way from home, and feeling very nervous about tackling a new job in unfamiliar surroundings. Most ministers would have shaken hands, and with a few smiling words have dismissed me from their minds. I expected nothing more, so you can imagine my surprise when on the following Tuesday evening he called on me and found me in my solitary lodgings writing home to ease that homesick feeling!

After a friendly chat he asked if I would care to go up with him to a Debating Society his young men held each week in one of the vestries. I assented with alacrity, and found some fifteen young fellows seated round a big table. Mr. Walters took the chair and seated me on his right hand, the essayist, a bank man older than the majority of us, being on his left. When the paper was read the discussion went round the table and finally reached my corner. I was asked to speak, and as it happened I knew the subject fairly well, and disagreeing profoundly with the essayist's views, I said so. That broke the ice! After the meeting we all went home in a bunch and I quickly made some good friends.

Next I pushed my way into the choir, and into other activities connected with the church, with the result that when the time came for me to move on, I was exceedingly sorry to go. May I be allowed here to place on record the wonderful influence on the lives and characters of the young men of his church that David Walters had? To this day we remember him with affection and gratitude.

I next went to a Lancashire town which shall be nameless. My beloved pastor had written to the minister about me telling him to find me something to do; but nothing happened. I went to the church and several officials spoke and shook hands. As I came out one of them stopped me and asked if I expected to come regularly. When I assured him my transfer might be expected any day, he handed me an envelope and asked me to read the enclosure when I got home. It was an invitation to join the Freewill Offering Scheme, and a form was enclosed for my signature stating how

much I was prepared to subscribe. Nothing like making hay while the sun shines!

The next Sunday I invaded the minister's vestry after the morning service, and he told me he had "heard about me". He was an old gentleman, and not a bad sort, but he is long since dead; so I shall be charitable and say no more than that we never hit it off very well together.

On my way out I asked one of the deacons about the Sunday School, and he advised me to visit it and make myself known to the superintendent. This I did, and was speedily enrolled as a teacher. Again I gate-crashed my way into the choir, and by the winter following, along with some kindred spirits, had got a Young People's Society going and was putting in full time in the work of the church. I made many good friends there, and had numberless happy experiences during my sojourn in that town.

I need detail no more of my "adventures in church membership" because the above two are typical and fully illustrate my point. If you want to find a sociable church you must be ready to be sociable yourself; ready to meet advances half-way—or even further. You have to convince the members that you are willing to try to make some contribution to its life and work. Then you will find yourself welcomed warmly into the fellowship. After that you can choose at your leisure the friends with whom you desire to become more intimate, but you need never be afflicted with that lost and lonely feeling the people complain of who declare that the churches are unsociable.

It is well that we should have the challenge to Christianity stated with the clarity of Mr. R. F. Delancey Wellbye's *What the Future Demands of Religion* (Watts, 5s.). That Church Christianity has utterly failed is, Mr. Wellbye says, universally admitted, but it must not be thought that the claim that the "pure" Christianity which the Churches have forsaken is any the more satisfactory. The new faith that lies beyond, but not within, Christianity, "pure" or institutional, is

> a natural religion, rooted in the new knowledge and combining with it what is permanent and secure in the old, [but discarding] *in principle*, precepts and injunctions.

The supernatural is now impotent to provide a basis for a justifiable faith; it must be replaced by a new philosophy which

> proclaims the supreme worth of personality, dynamically conceived, and, issuing from that, the individual's right not merely to liberty, but to experience, to richness of life, to education in the broadest sense.

The Bishop of Chelmsford always speaks his mind, and what he has to say is always worth consideration, no matter how seriously we may at times disagree. The eight chapters in *It Can Happen Here!* (Hodder, 3s. 6d.) express the conviction that the war really began in 1936, that Britain failed in regard to Spain and Czechoslovakia, and that the war with Hitlerism is a war in defence of religion. The book ends with a plea for definite Christian education.

ON READING AND LIVING

By W. R. Niblett, B.A., B.Litt.

Among the things which get in the way of fresh and vital living is a sheer failure to sense and to experience. The capacity for seeing and sensing things vividly seems limited: life very easily becomes a dull set of facts and mere objects. And we can learn no more until, as it were, we receive from somewhere a new supply of vision with which to learn it.

One of the first essentials for living appreciatively is being able to see and hear and taste and touch for their own sakes, instead of just making use of sight and hearing and taste and touch for the practical purpose of identifying food as food-for-eating, or an acid which gives off a certain odour and has a certain colour and a certain taste as the compound analysable as HCl.

During childhood an imaginative way of looking at toys and houses and roadways is almost universal. But this imaginative power to take delight in things just because they are so full of an interest native to them, is apt to become the more rare the older we grow. It is often sacrificed on the altars of morality, of money-making or of correct behaviour. "A child in the full health of his mind", says C. E. Montague,

> will put his hand flat on the summer turf, feel it, and give a little shiver of private glee at the elastic firmness of the globe. He is not thinking how well it will do for some game or to feed sheep upon. . . . The child's is *sheer* affection, the true ecstatic sense of the thing's inherent characteristics. No matter what the things may be, no matter what they are good or no good for, there they are, each with a thrilling and unique look of its own, like a face, the iron astringently cool under its paint, the painted wood familiarly warmer, the clod crumbling enchantingly down under the hands, with its little dry smell of the sun and of hot nettles; each common thing a personality marked by delicious differences.

Such power of splendid perception tends to get more and more unusual—unless we are artists or poets—the older we grow. This is but natural; and if this elemental sort of ability to sense the world disappears, there are, after all, many compensations—the ability to think abstractly, for example, or to become experts in scientific method. But these are not *substitutes*. Quite fundamentally we are dependent all our lives long upon our capacity to perceive the world deeply enough. And if the elementary power of getting experience through the senses be lost, then, though we may

not know it, life is made a poorer thing. For at bottom each of us creates his world for himself; no one can see for us or hear for us, though they may tell us of fruitful ways of looking and listening.

One important element in genuine feeling is right sensing and experiencing; for without those we soon begin to adopt other people's feelings as our own and become without knowing it rather second-hand men and women, only partly alive. It is upon the quality of our feeling and awareness that the quality of our living depends. And the prime reason for reading good literature is just this: that good literature preserves and perhaps increases our powers of experiencing, our "hospitality to life", whereas bad literature, sentimental stories, journalism, destroy these powers. Reading stimulates our natural interest in all the wonderful and strange things that are going on in the world. But it does more than this: to certain people poetry and literature come with creative force: to read *Hamlet* makes them not more like Hamlet but more like themselves.

The test of the worth of a book to any individual lies indeed in the effectiveness with which reading it has power to restore him to reality of feeling and of thinking. This is true whether the book is a recent one or one written hundreds of years ago. It is the secret of the power of Chaucer as of Shaw, of Shakespeare as of Unamuno, of Dante as of T. S. Eliot. But no doubt twentieth century writers have become more conscious than their predecessors of the need for restoring themselves and their readers to a keen delight in sensing—for they know well enough that in an age of mechanism and noise, unawareness and insensitiveness are almost necessary protections.

One of the most obvious qualities of twentieth century poetry and prose in Europe is the liveliness of sense of which it gives evidence in its writers. To read them, if our spirits are awake, is to re-inherit a birthright of sense-experiencing. I think, for example, of the novels of Virginia Woolf, D. H. Lawrence and Willa Cather, the poems of Michael Roberts and Stephen Spender, the short stories of Katherine Mansfield and H. E. Bates, the farm and animal books of Henry Williamson and Adrian Bell, the childhood chapters of a remarkable number of autobiographies, such as Compton Mackenzie's *Sinister Street,* Sigrid Undset's *The Longest Years,* Alison Uttley's *The Country Child* and *Ambush of Young Days.*

There is in many a passage of these authors a quiet recording of experiences which hold meaning in themselves as tightly and perfectly as a drop holds its water. Virginia Woolf sees the lives of her characters bound together by the succession of experiences they have had. Time and its flow are always the problem to her.

What gives us unity, individuality, except the memory we carry about within us of things that have happened? Her books—and supremely, perhaps, *The Waves*—celebrate the tiny victories over Time which sharply felt experiences bring. And through her unusual style she recaptures not merely happenings but the spiritual climate and mood which made them significant. Her style is not a trick or formula but the means by which she can transmute past events into live experiences. Such books as hers have the capacity to put us in touch with ourselves and make us alive at a deeper level than we were before.

So far we have thought of living chiefly in terms of experiencing, and have tried to see that reading good books is an aid to a continued retention and development of power to experience. But living involves much more than this. Power to experience is not an end in itself, for the most satisfying life is not one of mere sensations. To what do experiences contribute? How are they related to maturity and growth?

The extent to which a man has grown is to be tested by these among other things:—

1. The variety and appropriateness of his possible responses to life—sense of humour, analytic detachment, love, sorrow, humility.

2. The range and depth of his understanding of himself and other men and women. This is not the same thing as sympathy; it is the parent quality from which sympathy can spring.

3. His capacity for what might be called "unexcited joy"—by which is meant the sort of happiness which does not depend upon nervous excitement, for there is always something imposed and external in such happiness as that.

4. His ability to be involved in and with the whole of created existence, not seeking at last to be detached or a mere observer any longer, but to take deep responsibility for the world upon himself. This to the reason is madness and a mystery. Few men touch this degree of maturity for more than an occasional moment in their lives.

As a help towards growth of all these kinds, reading of great books is an incomparable stimulus. Literature of worth is always a sort of log-book of a mental and spiritual journey actually being made. The literature of any age is an expression of its hopes and fears, its intuitions about the meaning of life, its discoveries about men and women who change and depart and are eternally not the same. Every age finds out certain things about human nature and the interestingness of living which no other age has ever discovered and which no future time will quite recapture. This is what makes literature worth reading. Here indeed is God's plenty.

The experiences that any book yields must be largely dependent upon the mind to which it yields them, and according to our deepening experience of life the meaning of a book changes for us. What Shakespeare wrote is never the same to any two persons or periods; Shakespeare indeed never knew all the meanings which legitimately might be read into his plays. He is great because he expressed himself through characters and situations which have capacity to go on constantly developing and remaining alive. A great book must always remain contemporary with its readers. For if we read a book that is old, it is not as an old book that we *can* read it. The first test of growth was, we said, variety and appropriateness of response to life.

The variety of understanding for which literature calls need not be dwelt upon. A large and living heart and mind are necessary if one is to appreciate both Wycherley and George Fox, both Berkeley and Keats, Carlyle as well as Oscar Wilde, Falstaff and Lear too. But the increase in the range and depth of our understanding of men which literature can bring naturally depends upon the range and depth of understanding which we already possess. To him that hath shall be given. But it would be difficult to read *War and Peace* or *The Return of the Native* or *The Last Puritan* without an enlargement of perception. "Poetry", says Shelley—and he might have said "Literature"—"awakens and enlarges the mind itself by rendering it the receptacle of a thousand unapprehended combinations of thought". It is unlikely that our understanding will be capacious unless we have read widely. For in our own lives and characters we are desperately limited: a man's moral judgments will be narrow and subjective unless he has enlarged his understanding by books as well as living. For a man to be a good moralist it is not indispensable, for example, that he should be courageous, but it is indispensable for him to feel the value and virtue of courage. He may not approve of Macbeth's murder of Duncan, but he must have sympathy with Macbeth even as the murder is being done; he may not himself be old, like Lear, but he must know what it feels like to be old. Only a person thus imaginative, who has felt for himself thus widely and deeply, can have the materials to make good moral judgments should he wish to do so. We have to recognize that we can never get out of being human. If a man acts more divinely than anyone has ever acted before, he is merely enlarging the bounds of human nature, not escaping outside them. The alternative to not being experienced at heart is not being experienced at all. If a man does not accept life, there is nothing to accept in its place. Clearly, it is not enough to act morally according to one's lights if those lights themselves are insufficiently illuminated. Reading helps to make them brighter.

The third of our tests of maturity and growth was a capacity for "unexcited joy". Such joy is not necessarily an enemy of suffering. To describe going to a performance of *Othello* as an evening's pleasure seems an unwarrantable misapplication of the term. Pleasure and suffering are opposites, but not necessarily suffering and joy. Only the greatest art has the capacity to create a mood of calm joy. I know of no finer example than the middle part of the second movement of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony—a heavenly and calm light. But it is in some of Pascal's *Pensées* too, and in *Samson Agonistes*. It is indeed an accompaniment of the sublime.

And as for the fourth test—the ability of the mature human being to be involved in the whole of existence without detachment, there is, I know well, a mystical element here. Father Zossima in Dostoevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov* says:

> If you can take upon yourself the crime of the criminal your heart is judging, take it at once, suffer for him yourself, and let him go without reproach. And even if the law itself makes you his judge, act in the same spirit so far as possible, for he will go away and condemn himself more bitterly than you have done. If, after your kiss, he goes away untouched, mocking at you, do not let that be a stumbling block to you. It shows his time has not yet come, but it will come in due course. And if it come not, no matter; if not he, then another in his place will understand and suffer, and judge and condemn himself, and the truth will be fulfilled. Believe that, believe it without doubt; for in that lies all the hope and faith of the saints.

All Dostoevsky's finest works have a sense of the ultimate majesty and divinity that is in man. And many examples contained in the Old and New Testaments will spring to mind.

Reading, then, is a great enlarger of heart and consciousness. "I am not the same person as I was before I read of the death of Cleopatra", Katherine Mansfield remarks somewhere in her Journals. With every new growth of personality there comes a need for expression of the new self which now we are. And for most people that expression will be through the quickened understanding and newly sensitized perception they carry into their daily lives, through the profounder quality of the actions and conduct of which they are capable.

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS

This Section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

RECONSTRUCTION AND RE-DEDICATION.

I PROPOSE to try and deal with some of the wider issues raised by the Reconstruction Fund. I need hardly say that I am in the fullest sympathy with the objects of that Fund. The raising of this money gives to the undamaged churches an opportunity of demonstrating the reality of their sympathy with those churches which have been less fortunate: but above all to damaged and undamaged churches alike it presents the challenge of the post-war world and its needs.

That challenge is one that obviously will not be met just by the re-erection of our tumbled buildings. What is called for is long and anxious thought on the whole question of the methods we are to employ in our work. These have not been so startlingly successful in the past few years that we can assume that we are going to carry them over almost unchanged into the post-war world. The facts are familiar. Suffice it to say that our churches, as someone has put it, "approximate more and more to Confucian Temples, a dwindling number of the faithful continuing to worship at less and less regular intervals at the tomb of their ancestors". Tomb, I am afraid, is all too often the right word! To many the Church, if not already dead, is fast dying along with the old order of things with which it is so closely bound up.

Such an impression, it is true, discounts all the spiritual life we know there to be in the Church, as evidenced, for instance, by the sacrificial giving that maintains the Missionary work of all denominations. The Church can say, as Mark Twain said of himself on on occasion when premature reports of his death had been circulated, "My decease has been much exaggerated". But do not let us be put off by the exaggeration from examining the truth that lies behind it. Let us ruthlessly overhaul our methods and the whole conception of the Church's work upon which these methods are based.

Let us beware, however, in learning the lessons of the past and applying them to the future of mistakenly envisaging the new Congregationalism within the old framework. Our aim is to provide a better Congregationalism, not for our parents, but for our children. We must do better than our military strategists who sought at the beginning to fight this war with the weapons and tactics of the last. To meet the needs of the post-war world we shall need new ideas as much as new buildings. It will not be

the long experience of age that will be in demand so much as the qualities of youth—its energy, its willingness to experiment, its spirit of adventure.

We need to take our young people more seriously. They do not ask to be fussed over, but to be given a job of work. They want not only to be allowed to manage their own affairs in their fellowships and clubs; they want to be given a greater say in the running of the church itself, and we ought to give it them. Let there be no more sneers about having to fall back in the end on the older folk to keep the church going, meaning by that, paying the bills! Youth has something more valuable than money to contribute. Easily the most important piece of work most churches are doing today is being done in the main by young people: I refer to the Sunday School. Youth would serve the church even more if only they felt that it was "their show". We have to set youth to capture youth, training them to give leadership to young people outside the church and win them for Christ. Maybe too they will succeed in imparting to those of us who are older something of their alertness and enterprise, for these, I repeat, are the qualities we need in planning for a world that may well be very different from anything we have known yet.

Just what that post-war world will be like no one knows; but this much at least we can say about it. It will be a world in which planning will be important because there will be so much more of it. Planned control has come to stay. As Karl Mannheim points out in *Man and Society,* the people who pour out floods of eloquence debating the relative virtues of planning and freedom are wasting their time, because there is no going back. Planning is inevitable. What we have to see to is that we make a place for freedom in our plan. Planning and freedom are not diametrical opposites. We can, and must, plan for freedom.

I suggest that we take this to heart in Congregationalism. If we are to preserve the freedom of which we boast in our denomination it has got to be a more carefully planned freedom. A very special responsibility may fall to us to see to it that in the more closely planned society of the future the spiritual freedom of the individual is preserved; but we shall not preserve our own freedom without more careful planning than we have shown hitherto. We have had freedom in the matter of settlements and removals —great freedom in theory; but with what unhappy results! When the Moderators were appointed they were given only advisory powers lest the sacred rights of freedom of church and minister be infringed! Is it surprising that many of the hopes their appointment raised have never been realized? Is it surprising that the thoughts of many Congregationalists have been turning more and more to some system of modified connexionalism? Is it beyond our ingenuity to find a plan for Congregationalism that will bring order where now there is confusion, and yet preserve in the main the freedom we cherish?

Looking back over the past few years it would seem as though our trouble has been that we have been trying to get the best of both worlds. We have been glad of all the advantages that have come to us through getting together in our County Unions and in our denomination as a whole, but at the same time we have struggled hard to keep our independency. It is a compromise that has worked—up to a point. But any real attempt at planning to solve our problems, like the Carter scheme, has been wrecked because it has come up against our precious independency. We are putting all the denominational machinery into action and are working together to raise the new Fund; but when it comes to spending it, the last word, of course, must rest with the individual church, even though it may mean

putting up the wrong kind of building in the wrong place. Independency again!

We have got to do some really hard thinking about this independency. At its best it was the counterpart in religion of that individualism that did so much to make a success of political democracy and industrial capitalism. It flourished when liberalism was in its prime and *laissez-faire* the order of the day. The death-knell of individualism, however, has been sounded. Indeed, it is in its final death-throes now. There will be no room for it in any case in the new world. The democracy that emerges from this conflict will be a very different thing from that of pre-war days. There will always be a place in it for individual effort and enterprise, but the community is going to count for far more and the individual for far less, his obligations to the community being stressed rather than his rights as in the past. Is Congregationalism then to cling to a principle that events have discredited, and to a way of life that is now out of date? We need to get much more of the community sense, remembering not only the benefits to be derived from closer union, but also the responsibilities involved. We need to accept the implications of the recent trends in our denomination towards a closer co-operation among the churches, and see in them the hand of God leading us out into a larger place.

Our concern in the new world, however, will need to be with something bigger than the new Congregationalism. We have got to look at the question of post-war planning in the larger context of the Christian Church as a whole. We cannot afford to plan our strategy separately as different denominations. Consultation at headquarters is not enough. We ought to have found our way to something better by this time. If the Churches stood at the cross-roads in this matter in the last war—to use J. H. Shakespeare's phrase—where do they stand to-day? Still there, some would say. Well down the path that leads to destruction, some would say. Make no mistake about it! Measured up against the big issues that will face us at the end of the war our denominational differences will seem so trivial that the Churches will lose what little influence they still possess if they persist in clinging to their separate divisions.

I know all the difficulties that stand in the way, but I have a feeling that we make a great deal more of them than we should. We are too frightened of giving our position away, too unwilling to consider the sacrifice of inessentials, too inclined in each denomination to talk of preserving our distinctive witness when what we mean is holding on to our opinions and expecting the other side to do the sacrificing. I am not pleading for uniformity. I question whether organic unity is possible at present. It ought not, however, to be beyond the bounds of possibility to find some working arrangement whereby we can lift such vital questions as that of Christian education out of the realm of sectarian debate and be enabled as one to face up to the other big issues that will confront us after the war. The alternatives are a certain measure of competitive building and a waste of our slender resources. The Church will need all her resources, material and spiritual, if she is to hold her own in the post-war world.

More serious, however, even than these denominational differences are those that actually cut right across our separate "isms" and threaten to prevent us from acting as one in relation to the greatest of all the issues that will face us at the end of the war—that of deciding on what lines the new world is to be planned. Is it to have a Christian pattern or not? There is no doubt as to what answer we should all give to that question. We should say "Yes" unanimously. But you soon see the differences that unanimity conceals when you go on to ask one or two further questions.

For instance, are we agreed as to what we mean by a society planned on Christian lines? How many of us would be prepared to accept the findings of the Malvern Conference or agree with Sir Richard Acland that the morality of loving our neighbour leads directly to the common ownership of property? When this and kindred subjects are introduced into our Union Assemblies we find ourselves pretty sharply divided. Similar subjects introduced into the average church meeting reveal even greater differences of opinion.

Then again, how far are we agreed about the responsibility of the churches in this matter of planning and just what that responsibility involves? There are still a good many of the members of our congregations who object to what they call "politics in the pulpit"; and by that they do not mean just party politics. They mean the discussion of the issues raised for Christians by such questions as unemployment and housing. If there are these objections raised merely to talking about politics, what about the differences we have to face when we come to action?

Divisions such as these, which are reproduced in every denomination, are much more serious than our denominational divisions, because they make the Church's utterance on this all-important issue a babel of tongues rather than one clear, certain, united voice. They do us more harm in the eyes of the man-in-the-street than all our denominational differences. He knows that there are all sorts of queer historical survivals in our English social and political life, old traditions and customs that have lived on—a great deal of the ritual in Parliament, for instance. He thinks of the different denominations as just another example of that. In a way he sees the point of our very different forms of worship. He knows that some people prefer high-brow music while others like something more popular. He imagines it is the same in religion. But on these issues that are of far greater importance to him and, as he sees it, to the world generally—well, divisions and differences there are a very different matter. He does not feel that he can put much confidence in a body of people who do not seem to know where they stand. He is apt to think us more retrograde than we actually are, more tied up with the existing order than we are, because the more conservative amongst us act as a brake on those of us who would like to "get a move on" in these matters.

More serious, however, than the misjudgments that arise, and the prejudices that are set up in the mind of the people we seek most to win, are the practical results or rather lack of them as far as securing a more Christian order of society is concerned. While the Christian Church is divided and uncertain, the vested interests that are the enemies of every better order are all too sure of themselves. They know what they want and how to get it. The result is the kind of world we are living in today! If the new world that we hope to see rising on the ruins of the old is to be after the Christian pattern, clear vision as to what is wanted and how it is to be secured is vital.

This is the supreme problem of reconstruction to which we need to give our most earnest attention. We need to set our own house in order; but reconstruction in the Church is only a means to an end—the larger task namely of the reconstruction of the world. If ever there was a time when the Church was called to live, not for itself, but for the world, that time is now. The situation facing us challenges us to re-address ourselves to our task of winning the world for Christ and His way of life. That is a two-fold task. It involves the winning of individual men and women, and the transforming of society. It is foolish to waste time arguing as to which of the two is the more important. You cannot separate them. They inter-

penetrate and influence one another. You will not, for instance, win the individual today without a social gospel. You have only to think of the way in which the conditions of his life and work are determined for him by the system of which he is a part and by the unions or associations to which he belongs to realize that a gospel to be adequate must address itself not only to his personal needs, but also to the environment in which his life is embedded and the system of which he is a part. The more life becomes planned, the truer that is. On the other hand, you cannot hope to make a new society without new individuals. You cannot bring in a golden age with leaden men. It is not only bad plans we are suffering from. What Christian plans there were after the last war were made of no effect by men's selfishness. Our Utopias came to grief because we sought to achieve them in our own strength. To build without God is always to build in vain. The basis of a reconstructed society is in re-dedicated wills and renewed individuals.

There are two things in particular that we need to do. On the one hand, we need to think out more clearly the kind of world we want to see or ought to want to see as Christians, being prepared to learn of one another and do all that we can to secure as large a measure of agreement as possible on the main outline of the plan. Compromise as between fellow-Christians is not a sin. It is essential to united action, essential above all if we are not to be involved in the compromise that is a sin—compromise with the world. On the other hand, we need to think out a new technique of approach to the individual. That involves both the message and the method. Somehow we have to secure the committal of the men and women outside our churches to the Christian way of life. We have to make the challenge of God in Christ real to them. We have to confront the individual—and here what is true of those outside is equally true of ourselves—with the price to be paid by him for the new order.

There are two kinds of people who constitute the greatest peril perhaps that the new order has to face. The one is the man whose only conception of the post-war world is of a world where everything will be as it was before the war, where it will be possible to slip back as quickly as possible into the old ways. We have that kind of man within the Church as well as without. The other is the man who talks glibly of a new world, but has no conception of the price to be paid for it, and certainly no intention of paying any part of it himself.

Paul said that Christ brought in a new creation—in the language of today "he inaugurated a new order". It cost Him a cross to do it. Nothing less than the efforts and sacrifices of re-dedicated men and women will give us and the world the reconstruction it needs.

G. R. C. Fuller.

ON LIFE AND BOOKS

INCREASING UNDERSTANDING.

AFTER being bombarded with questions for five months in Canada and the United States, I have returned home to find that the fusillade is maintained on this side. "What is a convoy like?" "What is it like flying the Atlantic?" "When are the Americans going to attack Japan?" "Is the War production as tremendous as we are told?" "What is the truth about sinkings?" "Will the Canadian and the American Churches help us in rebuilding our churches?" "Is Halifax a success?" . . . And so on, *ad infinitum*. Some of these questions I cannot answer, others I would not if I could! But there are certain impressions which may interest readers and may help to diffuse information and increase understanding.

* * *

To get this transit question out of the way first. It reveals no military secret if I say I went by water and returned by air. That experience leads me to prophesy that after the war few people will cross the Atlantic by boat if air-travel can be made sufficiently inexpensive. Yesterday I saw a statement that there will be so many air-ships available for passengers when peace comes that one should be able to fly across the Atlantic for £8 10s. That is far from being the case today; nevertheless to be in the United States one day and in London the next is not without its thrill, and it saves much of the time which is more than money. Travelling east to west, and putting *back* the clock five hours in crossing (six at present, with our extra hour of summer time) it may easily be possible to breakfast in London, lunch mid-way across, and dine in the United States. And I hope I shall live to do it! I say this with regret, for I enjoy travel by sea, and have happy memories of ocean crossings, some of them on ships now far beneath the waves.

In North America I travelled, I suppose, over 20,000 miles. In Canada I visited Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto, and Winnipeg, and crossed the United States from Coast to Coast, though I did not visit the South at all. From my diary I find that from leaving home I spent 25 nights in hotels, 3 in clubs, 10 on trains, 14 on shipboard, 2 in aeroplanes, 77 in Colleges or the homes of teachers in Colleges, 20 in other homes. The number of times I spoke I do not care to estimate, but I addressed everything from small Faculty groups to audiences of more than 2,000 people; many of the large audiences, it is good to record, were ordinary Sunday morning congregations. I cannot claim I met a cross-section of the people of North America, because, to my great loss, I had no opportunity, except three times at the cinema and once when I saw the Giants beat the Pirates, to mix with the mass of working folk. But of what the leaders of the churches, the educators (a great American word), and the politicians were thinking I had the chance to learn a great deal.

* * *

So many things stand out in looking back that it is almost impossible to decide what to choose. Many impressions were blotted out by later impressions; when I flew over the Rockies I said time and again as I looked out and down, "I shall always remember that", but now the only vivid memory is of the greenness of California after the desert and the mountains.

The others may recur, but at the moment they are lost. There are, however, certain things that I must say. They may be illustrated by the contrast between two speeches by the Prime Minister, both of which I heard in New York, the one in May, 1940, the other exactly two years later. During the interval Mr. Churchill has made himself a radio speaker second in popularity in America only to the President himself, and perhaps they should be bracketed equal! He has also visited the United States, where he won a tremendous reputation. On the first occasion he had just assumed office, and my flippant reaction was, "Well, if Winston is talking about the Almighty and Trinity Sunday we are in a much worse plight than I realized". We were. In the intervening two years Britain has faced Dunkirk and the Blitz, the tug-of-war in Libya, the incessant U-boat campaign, and the loss of Hong Kong, Singapore, and Burma. That the country has weathered the storm still resolute and determined, and now better equipped than ever before, is due in large measure to the spirit and skill of the Prime Minister. I can say that without laying myself open to the charge of flattery because in normal times I am *not* a supporter of Mr. Churchill; I happen to be a constituent of his, and I generally vote for the man with most chance (it has never been much!) of throwing him out: on one occasion I remember being so roused that I wrote to tell him that if he would leave politics for literature it would be better all round! So when I speak of his achievements during the last two years I am not speaking as a partisan. But how the man can write! In the bus today I was reading his *Great Contemporaries* (Macmillan, 8s. 6d.) just reprinted, and never have I been so unconscious of a journey. His speeches show the same remarkable gift of phrasing, form being married to content in perfect harmony. The speech to which I listened in a Club in New York on May 10th last was, I thought, admirable in tone and spirit—and so did all the Americans I met. But even Homer nods, and Mr. Churchill should have been saved from one omission—an omission every American remarked. "Two islands", said the Prime Minister, "have been in our minds all week"—every single American thought at once of Corregidor, which had that week surrendered after heroic resistance. When the speech went on, "They are Malta and Madagascar"—Corregidor was unmentioned—in the company where I was every eyebrow was lifted; that not a word was said in criticism at the moment I attributed neither to the restraint of Americans nor to the presence of an Englishman, but to the spell the speaker had cast.

This implies that everybody, from Prime Ministers downwards, should be mindful not to disturb the susceptibilities of Allies. The Axis propaganda machine is working night and day to cause distrust and suspicion between the United Nations. I wish we could feel confident that equally strenuous efforts are being made on our side. Certainly we must all watch our step to see that we do nothing to cause misunderstanding. In Washington when I was urging that more people should cross from Britain to the United States and *vice versa* in the interests of international friendship I received the reply from one in a position of great responsibility, "The trouble is that one wrong person does more harm than ten right ones do good". But we must find and send the right ones. Britain has still many enemies in the United States, and they are ever on the *qui vive*. Words that Mr. Leland Stowe has lately written should be taken to heart:

> I can understand the aversion of Americans toward those upper-class Britishers who have looked down their noses at us over the long years, rarely concealing either their snobbism or their envy. I myself have never had any use for this type of Englishman, who, it now

> appears, has succeeded in creating hundreds of thousands of isolationists in America, rendering the costliest kind of disservice to the cause of human freedom. But these particularly objectionable Britishers are not the British people, nor are they the ones who hold Hitlerism at bay week after week. Some of these, the small minority of insufferable Britishers, always hated to see America grow up. Now fate has punished them to a point where they, too, thank God that America *has* grown up.

It is easy for the British visitor to North America to forget how far the Dominion and the Republic are from the actual war, and how difficult it is for people so remote to realize their own danger and the realities of the situation, so easy to forget too that the United States between 1940 and 1942 has simply been following British policy between 1938 and 1940.

Perspective is naturally so different. I remember when in Los Angeles reading in the headlines that Americans had bombed "the doorstep of Japan". Greatly interested in this, I read on, to find that it was the Marcus Islands, 900 miles away from Japan, which had been bombed! That day I was to speak to a crowd of American men, so I presented this problem, "If 900 miles is the doorstep, where and what is 21 miles?" That audience, as all American audiences, was intensely interested in the ordinary life of the British people in war-time, embarrassingly appreciative of their heroism, and determined to support them in their struggle. One old man, who left Britain sixty years ago, put a note into my hand which I found contained a five-dollar bill for some child war-victim. But everywhere there were those who had been "rubbed the wrong way" by British snobbishness, or influenced by Nazi propaganda, or were suspicious of British imperialism, or simply so lacking in realism or so insensitive that they could not comprehend a situation thousands of miles away. What *is* the correct retort to a minister of religion who, told in answer to his inquiry that 54,000 civilians had been killed by bombing in Britain, replies, "Not a very large proportion of your population"?

What Miss Mary Trevelyan says of students she met in the United States in 1937 is still true of many, though less so now than it was in 1937 or in 1940, and growing less so every day as America comes into the front line. They

> were anxious to hear about their fellow European students, but I was struck with the fact that their interest was academic and subjective. They were so safe, these young Americans, and it seemed almost unkind to disturb their security by telling them of the kind of troubles other students had to face. The only fear they seemed to have, though that was real enough, was the fear of unemployment.

On every point the need for information, education, to give sound knowledge and true perspective, was obvious, and no doubt the same need would appear to an American here. If I escaped from any group without questions about India I counted myself fortunate. With few exceptions the questioners had accepted the extreme nationalist Indian view-point; often, when pressed, they confessed ignorance of the religious, political, and racial divisions in India, often they failed to realize that there were any benefits —such as long decades of peace—which the British *Raj* had conferred upon the Indian peoples. Towards the end of my trip, when the inevitable questions about India cropped up, after answering them to the best of my ability I would say, "Recently I have made my own solution of the Indian problem, which I shall commend to the British people when I return. I

shall suggest that we make a present of India to the United States''. There were never any takers.

The average Britisher would be immensely surprised to learn the picture of England before the eyes of many Americans. Our ''class system'', for example. In one city a reporter sent me a typed list of questions prior to an interview. One read:

> After the War will the class system be abolished, so that the sons of ordinary people, and not merely the sons of nobles and of the wealthy can go to Oxford and Cambridge?

He was surprised to learn of the large proportion of students at Oxford and Cambridge who come from poor and middle-class homes, and are in the Universities by the aid of scholarships.

How can misconceptions of this sort be abolished? We have, of course, many similar wrong ideas about the Americans, owing to some aggressive Yankee we have met or because we read Charles Dickens or because we think all America is Hollywood. The problem of mutual interchange of knowledge leading to fuller understanding is one which should be ever before all friends of peace, and this should be a concern of the churches. It is not enough that half-a-dozen ministers of religion should cross each way each year: the Churches should see to it that their representatives, the ambassadors of goodwill, move to and fro continually, even in wartime; they are quite as important as those engaged on commercial and military missions. And those with the good fortune to have had their training in a land other than their own, or to live in both countries, or to travel frequently in both, must be ever engaged in the work of mutual interpretation. Perhaps the interchange of men in the armed forces—American troops in Northern Ireland, Canadian troops in Britain, the R.A.F. scattered through North America—will unconsciously render service along these lines.

I have said that it is impossible to realize the fact of the war, and the urgency of the situation, thousands of miles away. That is seen immediately in relation to food and drink. I felt much as Mr. Leland Stowe did, returning to his own country after two years in Europe:

> What a profligacy of plenty is here in our United States, and what a criminal waste of good and needed things you see upon every side! Yes, it is wonderful to come home from a war, but in this unappreciated abundance and in this complacent normality of ordinary living there is something which borders almost upon the obscene.

In one Canadian city I saw more food and drink consumed during one evening than I had seen socially in Britain since the beginning of the war. And on my arrival I saw more drinking in the train during two days than I had seen since 1939. But in Canada and the United States as in Britain the drink interest is so powerful that governments tremble before it.

* * *

This article, intended to be chatty, has taken a more serious note than I anticipated. Perhaps that is natural. But I am anxious that it should not convey a wrong impression—that of criticism. We of all people cannot criticize the Americans and the Canadians—the fact that Canada is part of the Commonwealth makes no difference in this respect—because of their slowness in understanding the nature and might of the totalitarian menace: did not our then Prime Minister describe Czechoslovakia, a few hundred miles away, as ''a far-off land of which we know little'' and wave a piece of paper promising ''peace in our time''? I believe that the war

production of North America will be decisive in the War, that it will enable the Russians to resist the Germans on land, give us superiority in the air, and finally on the sea. Having inspected Canadian Air Training Centres and seen some of America's mammoth factories, often springing up almost in a night, I am not disposed to minimize the momentum of American war production. The old Detroit story at which we used to smile now almost reflects the facts. The Detroitian was boosting his city, and the Englishman replied that he had been to Detroit. "When were you there?" asked the patriot. "Oh, about three weeks ago". "Ah, but you should see it now!"

And while I believe American war production will be decisive, I believe too that the American achievement in welding men and women of so many national backgrounds into one people will be equally decisive in the political sphere. Read the names of a baseball team, a graduating class, or even of members of the House of Congress, and you see how many nations, European and other, go to make good Americans—and in less than a generation. I know what is to be said against American democracy—and Americans know it themselves. And I know the frailties and the foibles of the American people as well as they know ours. The conclusions to which I have come I found almost exactly expressed when reading Dr. L. P. Jacks's *Confession of an Octogenarian* yesterday. He said:

> I am tempted to say that America has succeeded as well as most countries in producing a genuine aristocracy and to proclaim, without pretending I am uttering a scientific fact, that the best Americans are the best people in the world. Such at least was the impression made on me as a young man in 1887, nor has the impression been modified by a much wider (but still inadequate) knowledge of America gained in later years. There was a time when I would have added that just as humanity has nothing better to show than a good American so, *per contra*, it has nothing worse to show than a bad one. To the first of the two statements, both of the impressionist order, I still adhere; but now, with Hitler and his gang before me, I regard the second proposition as untenable, and withdraw it without qualification.

This could be illustrated from every part of American life. I believe that now there are better books being written in America than anywhere else in the world—and probably worse, though I did not see them. The standard of American sexual morals is often said to be low, though I refuse to believe the astounding statement made recently in an American book that one out of every four American married people commit adultery. Granted that divorce is much more common than it is in Britain. Yet it is my experience that never have I seen happier marriages than I have seen in the United States: possibly the co-educational colleges have as much to their credit on this side of the ledger as their critics say they have on the other side.

Looking back over the last six months it is clear to me that two duties are laid upon every Christian and every believer in democracy.

The first is to see that the present alliance between the United Nations is strengthened during the war and maintained after the peace. If China, Russia, the United States, and the British Commonwealth can pursue a common policy, there is some hope that the next generation may escape the horrors that we are experiencing. Otherwise civilization seems doomed. Axis propaganda is well aware of this, and is constantly active; Dr. Goebbels finds no difficulty in saying exactly the opposite things to

Britain and America on the same night. Its campaign to divide Russia from the democracies is untiringly waged, and not without success. A week or two ago I read an editorial in a Hearst paper arguing that not too much help should be sent to Russia because the United States would have to fight Russia when this war was over! Alike in Britain, Canada, and the United States there are those who think no good thing can come out of Russia, and naturally there are Russians who are suspicious of many in high position in the democracies—and not without good reason.

The second is to see that no thoughtless criticisms, no foolish gibes, are allowed to be thrown into the machine and so prevent smooth co-operation between the English-speaking peoples. Sometimes small differences in social customs can cause misunderstandings, and this should be ceaselessly watched. Our British reserve and habit of under-statement can easily mislead the more effusive and expansive American. The shy and quiet way British women in American homes express appreciation can easily be thought ingratitude by those accustomed to "Thanks a lot" or even (and for a sermon!) "Thanks a million". Often I have had to explain this, even to loyal friends of Britain, disturbed by what appeared lack of gratitude in their guests. Explaining the different *mores,* I have gone on to say that we Britishers needed a much fuller vocabulary when in the United States. I found mine in a barber's shop. The man cutting my hair said he had been on the job 35 years. To my remark that he must have cut the hair of a great many people during that time, he replied, with a fine *crescendo,* "Yes, sir! Very! Indubitably! Infinitesimal!" Now that kind of vocabulary is what we need to express our appreciation of American help—for the hospitality we know so well, for the aid sent through the churches, for ever increasing support in the war effort. And neither American over-statement nor British under-statement must be allowed to disturb for a minute the harmony and co-operation between the two peoples. For that harmony and co-operation is the hope of mankind.

ALBERT PEEL.

Though it hangs fire at the beginning, *God's Warrior* (Faber, 9s. 6d.), by Patry Williams, soon develops into a cheerful blaze. It is the well-written account of the long rivalry between Dunstan and Queen Elfryth, against the background of life in Anglo-Saxon England, which is painted in considerable detail.

Had we no knowledge to the contrary we should gather from *The Scene is Changed* (Macmillan, 12s. 6d.) that Mr. Ashley Dukes was like Melchizedek, without parentage, or that he sprang on to the stage full-grown at the age of twenty. This readable biography is about the theatre, the part Mr. Dukes has played in it, and the dreams he has dreamed about it, the major one frustrated by the coming of the war, though previously the author had run a small theatre on his own lines. Whether he writes of drama on the Continent, the War of 1914-18, or travels in America, Mr. Dukes is lively and interesting. But we wish he had suggested that there were other Dukes on this planet!

CURRENT LITERATURE.

"Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

"A Good book is the precious life-blood of a master-spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(*The place of publication is London unless otherwise stated.*)

The Christian Faith: An Inquiry into Its Adequacy as Man's Ultimate Religion. By Nels F. S. Ferré. Harpers. $2.00.

Dr. Nels Ferré is one of the most promising of American Congregational scholars, and we are glad to see a new book from his pen. Systematic theologians are not too common in our midst, and it is good to see one of the younger men setting himself to the study and exposition of theology as a life-work.

Dr. Ferré starts out with a brilliant opening chapter on "The Human Ultimate". He urges that

> Christianity offers even on the human level . . . the highest ideal realization of man's deepest needs.

It meets man's need for life, and for freedom which is essential to life, but a freedom that is faithful to something:

> Man wants to live. He wants to live freely. He wants to live for something greater than himself. The thing he really wants to live for is fellowship. . . . Creative good will effecting freedom and faithfulness in fellowship, therefore, is man's true good.

This leads to a discussion of "The Historic Ultimate", with the definition of Christianity as

> a God-centered, God-given freedom and faithfulness in fellowship based on the kind of love first fully revealed and made effective as light and life in Jesus Christ.

Subsequent chapters are entitled "The Progressive Ultimate", "The Religious Ultimate", and "The Christian Ultimate": they discuss revelation, nature and history, miracles, Incarnation and Atonement, always suggestively and always building up step by step on the previous argument. The book is important and valuable, and should be studied by all students of theology. We would offer two criticisms—one of the content, the other of the form.

Dr. Ferré is an earnest believer of the tradition of Nygren and Aulén. He tries hard to hold the balance even between traditionalism and liberalism, and no doubt believes he succeeds. He probably does not realize, however, the tremendous pull of his personal heritage, and this gives the impression—we used to have it at times in theological conferences led by R. F. Horton—that while supposedly we must follow wherever truth lead, it always leads, and cannot but lead, to orthodoxy. Is there anything Dr. Ferré discards? Is there anything he is willing to discard? The Virgin Birth, the Second Coming, the miracles? Dr. Ferré talks of the gift and the wrapper, but he never admits that some wrappers are so moth-eaten and outworn that it would be well to throw them away.

As to form. We suggested that Dr. Ferré harmed the prospects of his ast book by the difficult opening philosophical chapter. This book is pre-

cisely the opposite. The opening chapter is the best in the book, and the opening paragraphs (see "Worth Noting") a perfect Introduction. Several readers have remarked, however, that they found the second half of the book difficult reading, and that is our own impression. What the book needs is windows, illustration, to help the traveller along. The book is that of a professor, it comes from the class-room. We prescribe for Dr. Ferré a summer pastorate, preaching to ordinary folk every Sunday, a base-ball game every week, and a children's party once a month.

This book is so good that it is a pity it has not been made more appealing. Dr. Ferré is clearly destined to be one of the leading systematic theologians of our time: it is stimulating to learn that he is already at work on a ten-volume Christian theology which is to be his life's task. If to his intense faith, his keen insight, and his wide knowledge, he can add gifts of style—and there are many indications in this volume that it is far from impossible—the Church of God will have abundant reason to be grateful for him. EDITOR.

The Historic Mission of Jesus. By C. J. CADOUX, M.A., D.Litt., D.D. Lutterworth Press. 21s.

There is a massive quality about all Dr. Cadoux's writing, whether it be on Catholicism and Christianity, or Evangelical Modernism, or Smyrna, and it is manifest in this "constructive re-examination of the eschatological teaching in the synoptic gospels". "Constructive" is a justifiable epithet, for the study proceeds in an orderly and logical fashion from stage to stage. The table of contents, the summaries, indexes, and cross references provided by the writer, to say nothing of the footnotes with their witness to a prodigious acquaintance with the relevant literature (the 116 titles quoted in the bibliography are not exhaustive) are a model of skilled and thorough craftsmanship, and of invaluable service to the reader. One has only to compare, *e.g.*, Bacon's *Gospel of the Hellenists*, which has no index and no summaries, to note the gain or loss in usefulness.

Another outstanding feature of this work is its plea for and defence of candour in religious thinking. I once heard a sermon on the text "The spirit of truth shall guide you into all the truth", in which the preacher carefully delimited the bounds of the guidance. But, as Dr. Cadoux points out, critical scholarship must not be subordinated to the supposed needs of theology, and those who strangely use either Schweitzer or Barth to discredit historical research or to demolish "liberal" Christianity are repeating the mistake of Tertullian *On the Prescription of Heretics*, "a most plausible and most mischievous" proceeding, as Hort called it.

Again, the particular theme of the book is so vitally bound up with the teaching of Jesus as a whole that the student will find here, by working through the index of Scripture passages, a pretty complete commentary on the Synoptists and fresh light on many hard sayings and difficult passages. And he will find some excellent and concise *résumés* of recent exegetical debates, *e.g.*, concerning "realized eschatology" and the interpretation of certain Greek words on pp. 195 and 197-200. The preacher too will find guidance and suggestion and sermon stuff in overwhelming abundance.

After an Introduction setting out the aim of the work and including a brief but significant autobiographical passage ("I had come to realize that whatever the consequences might be, the relevant facts of history in their entirety must be honestly faced") the book has four parts:—I, The Bringer of the Kingdom of God ("Sonship takes precedence over Messiahship"); II, The Nature and Presence of the Kingdom of God; III, The Future of the Kingdom as first envisaged; IV, The Future of the Kingdom as last

envisaged. A Conclusion recapitulates the purpose of the book, emphasizes the plea for candour that has already been referred to, and has some pertinent applications to present-day conditions.

In Dr. Cadoux's judgment eschatological conceptions were secondary to the practical moral and religious issues that Jesus had to face. His mind was not dominated by a fixed programme of the future or the "last" things, nor by a desire to fulfil *au pied de la lettre* the "prophecies" of the *O.T.* Hence two corollaries: (1) At the outset of his ministry Jesus expected Messianic recognition and following rather than rejection and martyrdom, (2) he was profoundly concerned over the danger attendant on the mutual antipathy of Israel and Rome. When it became plain that Israel would have none of him, Jesus accepted the issue, believing that as with the suffering Servant of *Isa.* 53 his death would lead to man's repentance. But he could not see when or to what extent this change of mind and heart would come, and it "was clear that in repudiating him as Messiah the Jews were repudiating the only policy which would save them from revolting against Rome and . . . from the horrors of Roman conquest". Hence the growing urgency of his appeals. He expected after a sojourn in Paradise to return to earth in glory. Meanwhile his disciples were to proclaim his gospel, endure hardness, stick together and be ready for his return. That return (following the fall of Jerusalem) would inaugurate the great Advent of God's Kingdom, the general resurrection, and the last judgment with its assignations either to Gehenna or to the Kingdom of Heaven with its Messianic banquet.

It is only natural to expect that there will be some divergence of opinion on Dr. Cadoux's interpretation of his data, and some may profess to discern a bias towards the author's well-known pacifist position. But no one can honestly deny his faithfulness to an objective examination of the data or the care with which he proceeds from step to step. Both the plan and its execution seem to me to be admirably conceived and handled. The only place where I thought the argument a little strained was in his discussion of the ethical teaching of Jesus as "legislation" (pp. 118 f). Over against that one can set, *e.g.*, his handling of the tensions in the attitude of Jesus to the Law (p. 80) and to universalism (p. 161). It is a book that will bear reading and re-reading, a book to be on the handy shelf. I think it owes not a little of its spirit and power to that great and revered teacher, Vernon Bartlet.

I have noticed a few misprints—pages 1, 44, 50, 60, and 338—and I want to thank the author for using Theodore Parker's hymn as an Epilogue.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

The Eternal Kingdom. By C. J. WRIGHT. J. Clarke. 5s.

Dr. Wright is a distinguished member of the staff of Didsbury and Hartley Victoria Colleges and the first president of the newly constituted Federal Free Church Council in Manchester. He is known to discerning readers as a collaborator with Drs. Manson and Major in *The Mission and Message of Jesus,* his special contribution being the Fourth Gospel.

The telescopic title of the present volume is a combination and contraction of two outstanding Gospel phrases and conceptions, 'the Kingdom of God' and 'eternal life.' These ideas are inseparable, even as their counterparts, social service and personal experience, cannot be disjoined. The psalmist's "Trust in the Lord and do good" is emphasized and amplified and exemplified in the teaching and life of Jesus, whose ethical teaching and teaching about God are integrally one.

In clean cut and straightforward English and with many apposite literary allusions Dr. Wright develops his theme by showing how the Eternal Kingdom has its source in God, was incarnate in Jesus, and finds an extension of that incarnation in the sons of the Kingdom. A concluding chapter deals with the goal. He is confident that it will be reached, though how and when and where are matters for reverent agnosticism. It is a book that will bear many perusals, it has nutriment for head and heart, and can be commended to pew as well as pulpit.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

The Works of Gerrard Winstanley. Edited with an Introduction by GEORGE H. SABINE. Cornell and Oxford Presses. 30s.

Gerrard Winstanley, whose "platform for a communistic society . . . is complete enough to rank as the first socialist utopia formed in the hope of becoming a party program", has long needed fuller attention. The *D.N.B.* article is quite inadequate, and in other works passing references to him are often inaccurate, *e.g.*, the assertion that he influenced George Fox, whereas the interest lies in their being independent products of the same spiritual climate. All the works known to have been written by Winstanley are here reprinted, except his three earliest pamphlets, of which abstracts are given; and several pamphlets and broadsides connected with his Digger Movement are reprinted in an appendix. The documents of the Movement and its leader can thus be studied within the compass of some six hundred pages.

The seventy pages preceding these are devoted to an introduction, in which Professor Sabine writes of Winstanley's biography, Communist society at Cobham, antecedents and connections, religious argument, political argument, and Communist commonwealth. He shows that Winstanley was one of many who passed from conventional religion through the Baptist denomination to more mystical convictions, and whose enthusiasm included trances; what differentiates Winstanley from his contemporaries is the economic turn in his mysticism, the words which he heard being "Work together; Eat bread together". Professor Sabine provides a full spiritual context for Winstanley, effectively comparing and contrasting him with the Quakers, Levellers, and Fifth Monarchy Men, and placing him with such radical individuals as Everard, Saltmarsh, and Dell rather than with the members of any denomination which maintained a creed, a discipline, and a rational theology. (The line Professor Sabine desires to draw between mystics and Independents is possibly less sharp than he supposes; there were border-line cases, *e.g.*, Cradock, Sterry, Petto, Llwyd.) Professor Sabine more than once remarks on the secularist bearing of Winstanley's attitude, issuing though it did from a genuinely religious motivation; Professor Woodhouse's remarks on Roger Williams (*Puritanism and Liberty*, intro., 85) may be helpfully compared here.

> In the first enterance into the Creation, every man had an equall freedom given him of his Maker to till the earth. . . . But this freedom is broke to pieces by the power of covetousnesse, and pride, and self-love. . . .
>
> For surely the Father will give as large a liberty to his children to inherit the earth, as he gives to the beast of the field; . . .
>
> But you will say, Is not the Land your brothers? and you cannot take away another mans Right by claiming a share therein with him.
>
> I answer, It is his . . . by creation right . . . ; then it is mine as well as his, for the Spirit of the whole Creation, who made us both, is no respecter of persons.

Such is the spirit of this man. What befell him and his followers was an indictment in the Surrey Assizes, that they "riotose routose et illicite effodierunt, anglice did digge up". In a day when not a few are attempting fresh experiments in Christian Communism, his rehabilitation is most timely.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

Redemption and Revelation. By H. WHEELER ROBINSON, M.A., D.D. Nisbet. 12s. 6d.

This is without doubt the best of the many books for which Christian theology is indebted to Principal Robinson: it is a fitting crown to a long life of ministerial and professorial work. It combines a wealth of learning with a wealth of experience, and is further enriched with an abundance of literary illustration; so that it will not only be a mine for the theological student and the Christian minister, but is likely to be of service to a wider public interested in the present-day statement of the Christian faith.

The book falls into three main sections. The first contends for the actuality of history. History is not a mere shadow show. Its events are real and are of worth to God: in fact, they enter as an important factor into His life. It is maintained that this is the essential implication of the Biblical religion. The fundamental philosophical problem is that of time and eternity. Dr. Robinson does not profess to solve it further than to be sure that in some way time is a part of eternity, and that its events can constitute an enrichment of eternity.

The next section deals with Revelation, and is largely concerned with the principle of mediation. The question is: How do nature, language and history reveal God? The general answer is that all these *media* are of a sacramental character: the temporal in spite of its limitations can be the vehicle of the eternal.

In the third and concluding part of the book we reach the subject of the Christian Redemption, for which all that goes before is a preparation. There is, firstly, a chapter on Christology, in which the Incarnation is explained as the meeting-point of an ascent of man towards God and a descent of God into humanity: everything here turns on the kinship between God and man which makes their meeting in the God-man possible. The Barthian view of God as "Altogether Other" than man is to be totally rejected.

It results from this doctrine of the Incarnation that what Jesus did in time is the same as what God does in eternity: the work of Christ is the actualization in time of what goes on in the heart of God. Here Dr. Robinson accepts and defends the doctrine of the Divine passibility and undertakes to construe Redemption by means of it.

A review and criticism of other forms of doctrine than his own is given:

(1) The 'moral' theory of Atonement is insufficient. The suffering of Christ does more than reveal the Divine love. A redemption takes place through it which provides the objective content of Revelation. Redemption stands before Revelation in the title of the book for this very reason. Of course, the word 'Redemption' is not used to resuscitate the patristic theory of a ransom paid to the devil: it is chosen simply to express the objectivity of deliverance through Christ.

(2) The content of Redemption has been described as a victory; but we can no longer be satisfied with the idea of a victory over the devil, and if we speak of a victory over sin, the way of this victory requires further definition.

(3) It may rightly be said that Christ offered a sacrifice to God, and again that He is the Representative of men; but both these forms of doctrine, taken by themselves, are too "transactional", and are inconsistent with an "inclusive" Christology which regards the action of Christ as a part of that of God.

(4) An explanation of the Cross is demanded which holds fast to the unity of Christ and God in suffering, and finds in this suffering an objective Redemption which removes the obstacle to the Divine forgiveness. Here Dr. Robinson feels himself to be reproducing in a better way the old Evangelical doctrine, according to which forgiveness was made possible because Christ by His suffering bore the penalty of sin, satisfied Divine justice and appeased the wrath of God. The essence of this view can be maintained without its defects.

The old theory was right in attributing to God the exercise of retributive justice and indeed of wrath; but the way in which it reconciled this exercise with His grace was crudely transactional. Its essence is preserved and what is objectionable is removed, when it is recognized that it was God Himself who, though He might justly have reacted against sin in wrath, instead of this bore the suffering caused by it. This is the view to which an inclusive Christology leads up. In the specific but supreme instance of the Cross we see God suffering in time as He suffers for our sin in eternity. "His holiness could not conceivably have entered our world without suffering" (p. 271).

The essential act of redemption consists in what God does with the suffering which springs from and measures man's guilt. What He does with the suffering is described in three salient sentences, which contain the pith of Dr. Robinson's theology.

> (1) By bearing it as He does He transforms the suffering, and therefore removes the guilt (p. 274).
>
> (2) The bearing of it was grace, which is love in action. The result of that grace was the transformation of the event (p. 271).
>
> (3) His loving acceptance of it transforms it into grace, and removes the final obstacle to forgiveness (p. 274).

Dr. Robinson says that when once this fundamental position has been reached the familiar metaphors of ransom, sacrifice, satisfaction, and penalty can all be seen to have value as expressing partial aspects of the truth, though no explicit theory can be worked out from any one of them.

The book ends with a chapter on the work of the Holy Spirit in redeemed men: the Spirit is God Himself personally present in redeemed lives, effecting in them a continuous new creation of a personality destined by its nature for immortality.

When we review the doctrine of Redemption presented by Dr. Robinson, one thing is plain. It is meant to take its place as an ally of Evangelical orthodoxy in its controversy with the so-called 'moral' theory, more properly the 'experiential' theory, of the Atonement, first definitely proposed by Abelard. Thus Dr. Robinson speaks of himself as "old-fashioned" (Preface), and says that he has purposely chosen the word 'redemption' because of its suggestion of something objectively done by God independently of all human response to this action.

> The word 'redemption' is, in fact, a challenge to those who would argue that the activity of grace and its objective character consist primarily in the creation within history of a local point of 'influence' upon men (p. 220).

Let it be recognized that in this passage Dr. Robinson is much more just to Abelardianism than is usual with its opponents: he does definitely recognize an objective element in it, though he finds the degree of objectivity insufficient. The question, then, is as to the degree of objectivity which he himself achieves in his transformation of the old evangelical doctrine. In view of his own statements his teaching asks to be considered from this point of view.

His central position can be summed up by saying that God in His holiness feels the impact of sin, but instead of reacting in wrath reacts in grace which bears the suffering and transforms it into grace. I can only understand this to mean that God's grace finds occasion in His suffering on account of sin to be yet more gracious still: it is as when a wave meeting a rock is not turned back, but triumphantly flows over it.

Is there here any real analogy to the old theology? In order to retain the essence of the old doctrine in the new form it would be necessary for Dr. Robinson to say that God was wrathful with Himself for man's sin and punished Himself. Of course, he says no such thing. The nearest he gets to it is when he writes: "the truth of retribution is not denied, if God Himself shares in the suffering it entails" (p. 274). But to obtain a real analogy with the old doctrine, it is not enough to say that God suffers because of human sin: it would be necessary to represent Him as the victim of His own justice. Or if to avoid so unsuitable an idea, it were said that God bears the consequences of His own law, this will not help; for Dr. Robinson quite rightly tells us that 'law' is an abstraction, and that we must think of the personal God, in Whom, as Dale said, "the law is *alive*" (p. 273). Which brings us back to the beginning of the argument and to the impossible conception of God punishing Himself.

Is it not clear that God's "holiness" in Dr. Robinson's doctrine is quite a different thing from the "holiness" of the older doctrine which expressed itself in wrath? When Dr. Robinson says that God's holiness might so manifest itself, but does not do so, this is only the introduction of a dialectical idea in order to mediate the transition from the old theology to his new doctrine. A holiness which does *not* react in wrath is in fact only the passive side of the Divine love. God is called holy so far as He suffers on account of sin, but gracious so far as He loves and forgives the sinner. And when Dr. Robinson says that through His suffering God removes the guilt which is an obstacle to His forgiveness, the only way in which this is thinkable consistently with his own premises, is to say that God does not allow His suffering so to fill His mind with thoughts of human guilt as to deter His grace from action.

I conclude, therefore, that Dr. Robinson is not so "old-fashioned" as he imagines, but himself stands in the Abelardian tradition. He reminds me of the ancient prophet, who, having set out with the opposite intention, found himself constrained to bless. It is important to emphasize the manifold agreement of Dr. Robinson's final opinion with the Abelardian doctrine. The Abelardian like him teaches that Christ suffered because of human sin and guilt, and sees in this suffering the cost of man's salvation. He also agrees with Dr. Robinson that time-honoured terms like sacrifice and ransom have value as metaphors, though they cannot be made the basis of doctrine. Nor does Dr. Robinson say anything to which an Abelardian cannot subscribe *ex animo*, when he writes most movingly and beautifully of the objectivity of God's grace in the Cross:

> It is wholly independent of man, and even of man's eventual response to it, in the sense that it precedes and is not conditioned by this. It is *there*, waiting for our penitent approach, the perpetual sur-

prise of the awakened heart. It carries its own evidence, as all that springs from God must do (p. 276).

It seems to me a just estimate of what Dr. Robinson has done in *Redemption and Revelation* to say that he has combined Abelardianism with the doctrine of the Divine passibility. Now that the latter doctrine has become widely popular, the combination is likely to be more acceptable to many people than the older form of Abelardianism, in which the suffering of Christ is regarded as belonging only to the Incarnational form of the action of the Divine grace.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

We the Redeemed. By CHRISTOPHER TATHAM. Michael Joseph. 10s. 6d.

Under this rather curious title Mr. Tatham has written a curious and interesting book and one that should prove useful to many in these perplexing days. His subject is Life in the fullest and widest sense of the term. In the first part of the book he discusses the purpose of life and successful living, and in the second the power of religion to integrate and give point and meaning to the lives of men. The first part is mainly psychological, dealing as it does with emotional and mental states, the effect of mind on body and body on mind, and with the place of the individual in the community. Mr. Tatham has a good deal to say about introverts and extroverts, and about the necessity of blending the two temperaments if the human machine is to work smoothly. For the achievement of successful living and the avoidance of frustration he suggests a definite technique. First, we must have a perfectly clear idea of what it is we are aiming at, Second, we must intensely desire it, and Third, we must believe that that which we are seeking actually does exist.

In the second part of the book are discussions on the theory and practice of religion, natural and revealed, and on such matters as religious experience, prayer, worship, and meditation. Mr. Tatham has evidently had a wide pastoral experience, and his natural absorption in human problems inclines him to treat religion too much as a means to an end. There is also a slight undercurrent of superstition in his references to psychism, magic, and spiritual healing. Otherwise the book is a very sane and helpful contribution on an all-important subject.

W. B. SELBIE.

The World's Crisis and Faiths. By BARON ERIK PALMSTIERNA. Bodley Head. 8s. 6d.

The comparative study of religions is a fairly new thing among us, and is only slowly coming to its own. But it is a most valuable theological discipline and one of immense importance for the missionary work of the Christian Church. The need for it has recently been brought home to the public through the World Congress of Faiths founded at the instance of Sir Francis Younghusband. A prominent member of the executive of this Congress is Baron Palmstierna, once Swedish Minister in London, and he has written this book with the double purpose of showing how the present failure of civilization is due to spiritual causes and how the need of the future is a spiritual revolution such as can only be achieved by the co-operation of all religions. To this end he passes in review the great religions of the world, indicating how much they have in common and where they can correct and supplement one another. He believes that "religions may differ but religion is one", that God fulfils Himself in many ways, and that "His revelations take shape and colour from the soil in which the seeds

grow''. Christians, of all men, cannot afford to despise the day of small things and will do well to recognize the witness of God in other faiths. This book will help them and may be recommended as an admirable introduction to a very big subject.

W. B. Selbie.

Can we Keep the Faith? By James Bissett Pratt. Yale and Oxford Presses. 16s. 6d.

Dr. Pratt is one of the most influential of American thinkers and is perhaps best known to students on this side of the Atlantic by his psychological study of the Religious Consciousness published in 1921. Now at the close of a significant career he seeks to sum up what his reading and thinking and the experience of a life-time should have taught him concerning the religious tendencies of our time and the prospects of Christianity in the years immediately ahead. His standpoint is that of a Liberal Christian who is not a member of any Christian denomination, but as a sympathetic outsider desires the conservation and perpetuation of the Christian values which have been creative of all that is characteristic of the best culture of Europe and America. He deplores the widespread ignorance of religious teaching among the young people of our time, for which the Church must be held responsible, but believes that the most ominous aspect of the religious outlook is a growing attitude of indifference towards Christianity and indeed towards religion as such. He affirms his distinct impression that young people today feel much less interest in God, freedom and immortality, in the doctrine of the incarnation and in most of the fundamentals of Christianity than any generation of young people since the Reformation. Moreover all forms of religion in these days are suffering heavy blows at the hands of powerful political opponents, and it has become a vital and urgent question as to whether Christianity can survive at all, or whether, like other religions of the past and present, it is doomed to die.

Can we Keep the Faith? is therefore no merely academic question, but one that deeply concerns the future. The answer, of course, depends upon what we mean by the Faith. To Dr. Pratt, Christianity ''is a great spiritual stream taking its rise back in the first century of our era and flowing on down the centuries into our own times'' (p. 27). As a living thing it is not simple but complex, and ''has no such form of unity and self-identity as an unchanging dogma or an unchanging atom may possess.'' Its self-identity through the centuries is that of change and growth. It cannot therefore be tied down to any dogmatic scheme belonging peculiarly to this or that period of its growth. Much has been sloughed off in the meantime, and much may still have to be sloughed off. The fundamental criterion is reason, and dogma must ever be amenable to rational enquiry and test.

Nevertheless Christianity cannot be defined in purely intellectual terms. It is something very much more than either the teaching of Jesus or the teaching of the Church about Jesus. It includes a characteristic form of experience, of activity, and of belief. Its beliefs have always been accompanied by a characteristic emotional aura stimulated and expressed by certain traditional and revered symbols such as sacraments. As inner experience it may be defined as love for God and man expressed in active benevolence, and having for its background a certain kind of attitude to the universe which necessarily involves belief, but which constantly adapts itself to new needs and new horizons. Modification and elasticity are necessary to its continued existence.

Dr. Pratt does not regard scientific naturalism as a serious threat to the Faith. Thinking people recognize that, within its own sphere, science has its proper function, but is not concerned with metaphysics or theology. Nor can psychology, which has a right to investigate religious experience and to exhibit its relationship to other forms of mental activity, be permitted to rule out that experience of immediate awareness of God for which there is ample, widespread, and continuous personal witness.

In view of his appeal to reason and the religious experience, Dr. Pratt regards the revival of Authoritarian Supernaturalism in the writings of Kierkegaard, Barth, and Brunner, as a serious menace to the continued existence of the Christian faith. He declares that this constitutes a throw-back to a dead hypothesis, and a flight from reason. If this really is the Christian faith, he sees no future for Christianity. With Kraemer he recognizes that there is much that is genuinely good in non-Christian religions, but he would go further and refuse to grant to the Hebrew-Christian Scriptures and traditions any absolute or exclusive revelation. Christianity is not antagonistic to all human religious aspirations, nor is it necessarily superior in all respects to other religions. Nevertheless it is sufficiently superior on the whole to justify missionary endeavour. For no other religion equals Christianity in its stress upon the individual, upon the free moral will, upon moral responsibility, and upon love as finding its expression in active service. In this connection Dr. Pratt does not hesitate to speak of the finality of Christian ethics.

Dr. Pratt thus stands for a rational and undogmatic form of Christianity, as the only form which can possibly survive this generation. It is not a creed, although it is largely determined by its intellectual elements, which however find their main support and appeal in deep-rooted emotions, ideals and sentiments. He affirms that if Christianity should die out our Western world would be faced with the loss of a considerable proportion of its values for individual and social life. Already for whole communities the place of Christianity is being taken by militaristic nationalism in its various menacing forms, bringing cynicism and despair where once dwelt aspiration and faith. These new ideologies are declared to be basically the effect of broken morale. The spiritual integrity of civilization has been undermined. Nevertheless the moral ideals and teachings of Jesus, and probably some spiritual and theological interpretation of the universe, can never be entirely lost; and in any case the purely rational elements of the Christian faith, even if largely neglected for a time, would surely return.

The book is stimulating and thought-provoking, but many readers will be dissatisfied with its presentation of Christianity which for 2,000 years has offered itself to men as a religion of redemption rooted in a Gospel for which Atonement, Incarnation, Repentance, and deliverance from sin are cardinal features. It does not seem to the present writer that an undogmatic Christianity combining "God, freedom and immortality" with the centrality of Christ in ethics rather than in theology, is any more likely to succeed today than in the long history of the Church which has faced and overcome crisis after crisis by its unwavering faith in divine acts made manifest in the Scriptures and in life. We may not rationalize these acts away in order to secure a faith that will survive. We are concerned with the survival of a faith that is essentially the Christian faith, and to many it will appear that Dr. Pratt, with all his catholicity of feeling and the genuineness of his concern for the future of religion, offers something less than what most Christians in most times have regarded as the faith to be held at all costs.

E. J. Price.

Goethe's Poems. Selected by JAMES BOYD. Blackwell's German Texts. Oxford Press. 7s. 6d.

An Anthology of German Poetry, 1880-1940. By JETHRO BITHELL. Methuen. 7s. 6d.

Both these books are worth their price, although at first sight Mr. Bithell's offers more range and enjoyment than Professor Boyd's. The Goethe poems are without notes (an extra volume of these is promised) and they are printed in an ornamental and old-fashioned Gothic type which will be a hindrance to some readers. But it was well worth while to make accessible in wartime a collection of Goethe's poetry that can get us beyond the hackneyed favourites and grant a real revelation of the great European, who was none the less a true German. If we are to keep mental balance in the present conflict and to be alive to the world that will follow it we must again take Matthew Arnold's advice and reopen our Goethe. So doing we shall, patiently reading, be impressed and enriched by the majesty of the mind behind this poetry, by qualities which the Nazis would make us think un-German: the sense of law, of control, of unity in nature, of the creative activity of God and of the necessity of sacrifice.

Mr. Bithell has added another to his useful books on modern German literature (see this *Quarterly*, vol. XVIII, p. 209). He provides not only a wide selection but a most interesting introduction. All sorts of reactions to our strange modern world are caught and held in these poems. Much of their angularity, and of their penetration as well, comes from their recurring sense of the precarious situation of the artist in contemporary society. Here too, expressed with all the resources of German sounds, is the poetry of industry, of labour, of war and (most haunting of all) of exile.

W. G. MOORE.

China Rediscovers Her West. By Madame CHIANG KAI-SHEK and others. Allen & Unwin. 6s.

Written for the Missionary Education Movement of the United States and Canada by ten Chinese Christian men and women (including Madame Chiang Kai-shek), and nine American and Canadian missionaries, this book presents a panorama of the virile life in Free China today.

The great migration, the social ferment, the new life for the rural masses, the Christian faith in China's struggle for freedom, new China and the world Church, these and a dozen other topics are dealt with by men and women who are in the midst of this flood-tide of new movements; and the book can be warmly recommended to all who desire a quick grasp of the relation of the Christian Church to some of the outstanding facts of life in New China. In a brief review it is difficult to quote, especially since every one of these two hundred pages contains some pithy sentence revealing the spirit of new China, but this Chinese prayer is most revealing: "O God, do great things for China, and through her for the whole world by the rediscovery of her West. O Lord, revive Thy Church to face the opportunities, beginning in me". Marked features of the book are the sketches by a Chinese artist on the title-page of each chapter, a very good map, and a comprehensive up-to-date book list, though the preponderance of American publishers rather lessens its value for British readers.

MYFANWY WOOD.

SHORTER NOTICES & DESCRIPTIVE LIST.

(*Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading.*)

Though there is little that is new in Dr. H. H. Rowley's **The Relevance of the Bible* (Clarke, 6s.), one chapter of which has appeared in our own pages, it is a very useful survey of the position of Bible study today. An Old Testament specialist with missionary experience behind him, Dr. Rowley is an earnest believer in the Christian faith. He neither minimizes the Jewish background of Christianity nor the contribution of other religions, but he believes the Bible to have a unique place. Chapters V and VI (on "The Use of the Bible" and "The God of the Bible") seemed to us specially good, but the whole volume is a thoughtful study which ministers would do well to read.

It would be an excellent exercise, and a salutary discipline, for all ministers of religion to work through Mr. A. D. Howell Smith's **Jesus Not A Myth* (Watts, 15s.). While the views of Drews, W. B. Smith, and J. M. Robertson have not made much headway in this country, they have nevertheless caused a measure of disquiet in some quarters, and all defenders of the faith ought to be in a position to answer young people who ask, "Did Jesus really live?" Dr. H. G. Wood's book on the subject is helpful, but it does not marshal the evidence as does Mr. Howell Smith's. The conclusions reached will not, of course, satisfy the orthodox believer, but it is interesting to find one who calls himself a "Rationalist" writing, and the R.P.A. publishers issuing, a book against the Mythicists. The whole question calls some time for an article in our pages, and this will certainly be one of the books of reference. Conybeare's name is wrongly spelt on p. vi, and there is the strange word "mentation", probably for "mentality", on p. 48.

Dr. W. J. Sparrow Simpson has definite views, wide knowledge, and a clear head, and it is hoped that all Free Churchmen, and not least those enthusiastic for schemes of Church Union in South India and elsewhere, will read his *The Ministry and The Eucharist* (S.P.C.K., 6s. & 3s. 6d.). Dr. Sparrow Simpson has no doubt that the two Sacraments were instituted by Jesus, and that only men episcopally ordained can administer them; and no group, however distinguished, has the right to depart from this tradition:

> neither the Anglican Episcopate, nor the Lambeth Conference, is the final court of appeal . . . [but] the Collective Episcopate of Christendom.

South Indian and similar schemes therefore may be well-meaning, but so far as the Church of England is concerned, they are *ultra vires*.

Incidentally, we note that the "conditions indispensable to constitute the Eucharist" are, in the order named, (1) the material element, the use of bread and wine, (2) the use of a definite form of words of prayer, (3) a qualified minister. Nowhere is there mention of the assembly of the faithful or the faith of the recipient.

Dr. Sparrow Simpson suggests that between the episcopalian and non-episcopalian Churches there is a great gulf fixed: to show the intransigeance of Free Churchmen he quotes Dr. J. D. Jones, Mr. B. L. Manning, and our own pages. It is well to have the position so definitely stated as it is in this book.

"The Scholar as Preacher" series has contained some excellent examples of Scottish preaching, and another one is the Rev. A. A. Cowan's *Crisis on*

the Frontier (Clark, 7s.). At first we thought the Edinburgh preacher handicapped himself by rigidly adhering to the old three divisions, but he broke away, and secured greater freedom. Those who read sermons and those who preach them will, we think, appreciate the twenty here printed.

We trust the paper shortage will not result in the printing of any more books in so small and trying a type as that of Sir Tresham Lever's *Life and Times of Sir Robert Peel* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.). Especially is that the case where there is such a satisfying biography as Miss Ramsay's available, for this new book adds little to our knowledge. Nevertheless it is well written, with sympathy for its subject, and yet with discrimination. More care should have been exercised at some points; we read, for example: "The position of the Whigs was well expressed": an apt quotation from Hansard (taken from Miss Ramsay) follows, but we do not learn the name of the speaker. And if Sir Tresham treats Cobden in cavalier fashion, he pleases us by this Johnsonese sentence:

> but the bluff was called, and the house of Irish boasting was seen to have its foundations on the quivering quicksands of national verbosity.

An important addition to the volume is the facsimile of Disraeli's letter soliciting office in 1841.

Sir Tresham Lever's portrait of Peel is much to be preferred to Mr. George Dangerfield's, who has much about the Prime Minister in an irrelevant opening chapter in his *Victoria's Heir* (Constable, 15s.). This account of "The Education of a Prince"—how many of them we have had, and how tired we are of them!—strives to be clever, which does not make it any the less tiring. Albert and Victoria, especially Albert, were jealous of their boy, we learn, for Albert was as ambitious, desiring the irresponsibilities of the Crown and the power of a responsible minister at the same time, as Victoria was adoring. So

> the result was a fat, glossy, genial young man, with charming manners, no morals to speak of, and a wide knowledge of the foibles of the world.

It must be said too that Mr. Dangerfield's text, the Prince of Wales, is but the pretext for writing much contemporary history; we have, *e.g.*, a chapter, "The Absentee", describing the evidence at the Royal Commission on Housing, which the Prince attended only five times.

There are many facets to freedom, as is well illustrated in *Freedom: Its Meaning* (Allen & Unwin, 16s.), to which Charles A. Beard, Henri Bergson, Felix Bernstein, Franz Boas, Benedetto Croce, John Dewey, Albert Einstein, J. B. S. Haldane, Lancelot Hogben, Frank Kingdon, H. J. Laski, John Macmurray, Thomas Mann, Jacques Maritain, Bertrand Russell, Gaetano Salvemini, Vilhjalmur Stefansson, Henry A. Wallace, and A. N. Whitehead contribute—and how intolerant some of these exponents of freedom, *e.g.*, Haldane and Hogben, are! There is much good stuff in the volume, but the editing is wanting; there is an unintelligible "Prologue", and no indication whether there has been collaboration between the contributors, or when the articles were written—a footnote in the middle of Mr. Laski's article first shows it was written in 1932, and then an Appendix "seven years later" is added. There is, of course, much material for students in the articles, which vary greatly in length and value.

Probably when the history of our times comes to be written nobody will take a higher place than Field-Marshal Smuts: *Plans for a Better World* (Hodder, 8s. 6d.) contains a selection from his speeches between 1917 and 1941. Whether the reader's main interest be history, philosophy,

political theory, or the race question he will find here something for him, including some famous lectures and addresses given in Britain and to the British Association.

In *Treitschke's Origins of Prussianism* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) those able and indefatigable translators, Eden and Cedar Paul, provide an English rendering of *Das Deutsche Ordensland Preussen*, which dates from 1862. Many who know Treitschke's *History* have probably never read this account of the colonization of Old Prussia by the Teutonic Knights, in which the translators see the origin of Prussianism.

Mr. J. H. Curle's *Eskimo Pie* (Methuen, 7s. 6d.) has for ingredients the Belgian Congo and the Mackenzie River, the waning of religion, nationalism, dictators, prohibition, gangsters, chewing gum, contraceptives, the Diesel engine, unemployment, miscegenation and many other things. Mr. Curle has travelled widely and used his eyes; as a result we have many shrewd observations, but his prejudices stick out on very page—puritans (his authority on the Pilgrim Fathers is "a booklet published by Burbank Inc., Plymouth, Mass."), prohibition, and preachers, especially the Premier of Alberta. Mr. Curle knows a little about a great many things, but his dogmatism makes the reader wonder if it ever occurs to him that he does not know it all.

Dr. N. Gangulee's *The Mind and Face of Nazi Germany* (Murray, 5s.) is dedicated to "Those Who Still Ask: 'Whither Germany?' ". It is an anthology from "the writings, speeches, and slogans" of Nazi leaders from 1937, and is revealing indeed. To whatever chapter we turn, "The Führer-Saviour", "The Goal of Nazi Germany", "The Pattern of Nazi Freedom", or any of the others, a window is opened which lets out foetid air before we glance at the horrors within.

In reviewing *London Front*, letters which Mr. H. M. Harwood and his wife, Miss F. Tennyson Jesse, had sent to friends in America, we were ungallant enough to say we preferred the gentleman's letters to the lady's. That is certainly true of the second volume, *While London Burns* (Constable, 12s.), which covers a year from July, 1940: Mr. Harwood, like the rest of us, was often wrong in his prophecies, but he always keeps his head and never becomes either lyrical or hysterical! A correspondence such as this is of great value, for the more information Americans can receive about the life of ordinary people in war-time the better: it could be wished, however, that there were not so much "Dorchester" and "three maids", for that furnishes the kind of query British visitors to the States find it difficult to answer. But on the whole, the balance is decidedly to the good, and we hope that many Americans will read this graphic accounts of and shrewd comments on the English scene in this critical year.

We scarcely know what to say about the series "War Pictures by British Artists" (Oxford Press, 1s. 3d. each). Those received are *War at Sea, Blitz, R.A.F.*, and *Army*, and they are introduced by Admiral Sir Herbert H. W. Richmond, Mr. J. B. Morton, Mr. H. E. Bates, and Mr. Colin Coote respectively. Is the purpose to provide data for war historians, to provide war-time work for British artists, or what? And are all these artists British? Many of the portraits are excellent, and some of the artists have caught a scene for all time; there are some daubs, however, and Mr. Ardizzone's pictures bring to mind our first attempts to secure illustrations for serial stories twenty years ago.

Mr. Raymond Gram Swing introduces Mr. Edgar McInnis's *The War: First Year* (Oxford Press, 7s. 6d.), a careful and readable piece of work,

with maps and an appendix of relevant documents. The survey is restrained and well-informed, though Mr. Hore-Belisha is wrongly called a Conservative, and there is a misprint on p. 183.

All who have had to travel abroad in war-time, and especially those who visit the United States, will gain great pleasure from Mrs. L. S. Florence's *My Goodness! My Passport* (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.). An American, Mrs. Florence set out in March, 1940, with her husband, Prof. P. Sargant Florence, of Birmingham University, for work in Egypt. Caught there by the Italian entry into the War, they only escaped by way of America. Their sojourn in her home-land, where she had been a journalist, enabled Mrs. Florence to observe afresh the differences in American and British *mores:* about these she chats in a delightful and informing way. There is great need of mutual interpretation of the two countries to each other, and for this task Mrs. Florence shows herself to be well equipped.

Mr. Ammon Wrigley is by no means a T. Thompson, but his *Lancashire Idylls* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.) will give pleasure to many. Dr. Henry Bett in his Introduction rightly says that Mr. Wrigley's dialogue is much better when in dialect than in English, where the writer does not seem to be at home. We liked "An 'Orderment' ", "Telling the Tale", and "Jim o' Cowd Ben's and His Cow" best.

EDITOR.

Thirty-one volumes of *The Speaker's Bible* (edited by E. Hastings; T. & T. Clark) have already appeared. The volume on *Genesis* (9s. 6d.) is the last addition. As usual, there is a relatively brief introduction, surveying the contents and critical problems of this portion of Scripture. The rest of the volume consists of homiletical material (exposition, illustration, application) excerpted or condensed from modern preachers of every type. This is grouped around successive selected texts. That the series is useful to preachers its long continuance has amply demonstrated. "Dull would he be of soul who could pass by" so many topics without gaining some stimulus for his pulpit work. Other readers may find interest in the book as affording an instructive view of modern preaching, with its characteristics of brevity, short sentences, concrete application, and the appeal to the graphic and picturesque incident. The book will doubtless have as wide a circulation as its predecessors.

H. WHEELER ROBINSON.

The Making of the Synoptic Gospels by Miss B. K. Rattey (S.P.C.K., 1s. 6d.) is a kind of abridgment of her larger work on the Gospels and may be commended as providing a useful and reliable guide to its subject at a remarkably reasonable price.

Chapter I ("The Synoptic Gospels") should be renamed; it is really a sketch of the primitive church. Subsequent chapters deal with the oral stage (and form-criticism), *Q, Mk., Lk., Mt.*, on what may be called current conventional lines (proto-*Lk., etc.*), and the book is rounded off by a brief outline of the life of Jesus.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

Two recent Penguin books are worth noting. *Christianity and the Social Order,* by the Archbishop of York, is a firm vindication of the right of the Church to apply Christian principles in social and political reform, and suggests in clear outline the direction which such reform should take. Dr. Temple sums it all up in the words: "the aim of a Christian social order is the fullest possible development of individual personality in the widest and deepest possible fellowship". The firm grasp of Christian principle and the

sober statesmanship in its application which this little book reveals make one very thankful that its author is now head of the Church of England. We may hope great things from Dr. Temple's Primacy.

Another good Penguin is *The Gospel for Tomorrow*, by the Bishop of Truro. Dr. Hunkin is one of those who believe that the truths by which men live are few and simple. He has no new gospel to proclaim, but sets himself to restate the essentials of the old gospel of God's grace in Jesus Christ in such terms as may meet the needs of this revolutionary age. He has no illusions about the difficulty of his task, but, in spite of it, he has produced a modern Christian apologetic such as may enable a man to give sure and cogent reasons for the faith that is in him.

Some idea of the hostility which the Malvern Conference has aroused may be gathered from a pamphlet on *The Christian Social Order*, by Mr. J. Stevenson (The Individualist Bookshop, 6d.). It is a rather waspish criticism of the Conference and all that it implies based on the assumption that the Church exists to save men's souls and the State to preserve their bodies, "and never the twain shall meet". A complete and final answer to it may be found in the Archbishop of York's book on practically the same theme, which we have already noticed.

One of the saddest aftermaths of war is the host of sick, shell-shocked, and disabled men it leaves behind. Much is done to help them, but it is not always realized how much they may do to help themselves. This is the theme of a book by the Rev. J. C. Hardwick on *The Conquest of Disability* (S.C.M., 2s.). The author himself is one of the disabled, and so writes with understanding as well as with sympathy. He is a profound believer in the power of mind over body, and makes many wise, if tentative, suggestions towards a technique for increasing and exercising that power. He is not oblivious too of the help which religion can give, though it might have been better had he put his discussion of this at the forefront rather than at the end of his book. But in any case the book is to be cordially commended, and should bring new hope and courage to many stricken lives.

Mr. John Hadham has made himself well known, not to say notorious, by his books, *Good God* and *God in a World at War*. He has now followed these up with *Between God and Man* (Longmans, 3s. 6d.), which may be described as a rather ambitious attempt to survey the whole field of Christian revelation based on the central and inescapable facts of the Incarnation and the Cross. Accepting these as fixed points Mr. Hadham deals very freely and freshly with the development of Christian thought and the necessity of restating it in modern terms. The world needs God and must be brought back to God, but not necessarily to "the God of any existing creed or to the theology even of the Bible". As in his other books Mr. Hadham is happier in criticism than in construction, but his criticism is healthy and to the point. He is always stimulating and even provocative, but he does good work in helping Christians to rethink their creeds and rise above the merely conventional and orthodox.

In *The Strategy of Freedom* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.) Prof. Harold Laski writes an open letter to students, especially those of the American Universities. His object is to convince them of the duty and necessity of fighting and destroying Hitlerism and all its works if freedom in any sense worth talking about is to be preserved. He is writing before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbour and the American entrance into the war. That has so radically altered the situation that a great deal of what he has to say will

be preaching to the converted. Nevertheless it is still worth saying and may be commended to all concerned as an unanswerable case for participation in the war against the Axis powers. Prof. Laski is a most skilful and subtle advocate, and writes with a combination of cool logic and passionate feeling that makes his book really memorable.

In the flood of literature dealing with post-war conditions, hopes, and fears a little book by the Dean of St. Paul's called *The Foundations of Peace* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 2s. 6d.) stands out conspicuous for sanity and statesmanship. It might be fairly called an essay in Christian realism. Dr. Matthews writes from a definitely Christian standpoint and takes full account of the part which spiritual forces must play in any possible reconstruction. But he is equally alive to the social, political and economic aspects of the subject and to the need for radical changes. All who are concerned for the future (and who is not?) should read this book, for if we are to win the peace it will be along some such lines as are here laid down.

In *The Polish-German Problem* (Allen & Unwin, 4s. 6d.) Mr. Robert Machray gives a clear and succinct account of the German attempt to destroy the Polish nation on the one hand, and of the need for a restored Poland as an essential condition of peace in Central Europe on the other. The book puts the whole problem very vividly before us and sheds light on a very dark page of European history. It is illustrated by a good map and some useful statistical tables.

W. B. Selbie.

The Rev. Leslie D. Weatherhead's *Personalities of the Passion* (Hodder & Stoughton, 5s.) is a devotional study of some of the characters who played a part in Christ's death and resurrection. Mr. Weatherhead says he has himself been helped by trying to look at the central act of human history from the point of view of those who played some part in it. This book is distinctly helpful from that standpoint. Twelve characters are chosen, and the great events are looked at from what may be supposed to be their attitude. The addresses are characterized by a restraint which adds to their influence. I rather wish Mr. Weatherhead had included John—the man who perhaps saw furthest of all into these mysteries.

Canon Anthony Deane's *St. Paul and his Letters* (Hodder & Stoughton, 7s. 6d.) has been written, he says, to help average men and women to know more about St. Paul, and to read his letters with less difficulty and greater profit. The book undoubtedly fulfils these aims; but it will also be read with pleasure and profit by those who have long been students of St. Paul. The introductory essay on St. Paul covers 68 pages; it is a very human rendering of the Apostle's life and work; and although it is popular in form it is not slight, but has behind it ripe scholarship, while at the same time it is not overweighted with the erudition of the study. There follows a shorter chapter on the letters, giving a broad interpretation of them and of their setting. The finer points of criticism are left alone; but where some result of criticism adds life to the reading of the letter it is briefly explained. The second part of the book is given up to a paraphrase of the individual letters and a brief introduction to each of them. Whether it is better to read a paraphrase or a full translation may be a matter for two opinions; but these paraphrases are without question a great help in the harder epistles. This is a book which will do something to rescue St. Paul from the professional "debunkers"; it is full of admiration for Paul, and it has sound knowledge both of the man and of his work. I hope very many average men and women will read it; if they do, they will begin to

understand the man without whom the Christian Church would never have spread throughout the world.

There is plenty of need for instruction in the meaning of worship and for guidance in worship. *Training in Worship,* by the Rev. Lindsay Dewar and Miss Phyllis Dent (Rich & Cowan, 5s.), is therefore very welcome, and it is to the point. The meaning of worship is examined, and different types of worship are explained; the mistakes into which it is easy to fall are also made clear. In the last two chapters there is much that is very useful about the order of a service, and especially about the training of children in worship. The book is primarily for Anglicans, and some of what is said about sacramental worship will make more appeal to them than to the Free Churches. But there is much by which we can profit. The treatment of non-liturgical worship is slight, and seems to show some want of appreciation of its possibilities. When all is said and done, worship is less a trained art than it is the outgoing of the soul towards God. This is a good book, and it is of the kind needed.

Father Aloysius Roche's *A Bedside Book of Irish Saints* (Burns, Oates, 5s.) is full of delightful tales and legends of the old Irish saints. It gives an entertaining account of the kind of men these saints were, of their love of nature and animals, of their humanity, and of their works. The author does not ask you to believe all these tales in the way "Mr. Gradgrind" stood for facts; you can season them with a little salt. But he holds that beautiful legends only grow up around worthy men, and that they have a truth of spirit. One of the best of these tales is of how St. Domnoc brought the bees over the sea to Ireland. There is a chapter on "A life on the Ocean Wave", and another on "Solitude and Silence". Father Roche thinks we could do with a big dose of "the monastic calm, composure and recollection". This is a pleasant book, and reveals the author's love for days and men long past.

The Jew In the Christian World by Mr. Hans Kosmala and Mr. Robert Smith (S.C.M., 6s.) discusses the "Jewish problem" from the point of view of the relation of Judaism to Christianity in the past and in the present day. The discussion is partly historical, partly doctrinal, and in its later stages political, especially with reference to the modern movement of Zionism. In this latter connexion there is an instructive chapter on "The Quest of Modern Judaism", followed by chapters on "Anti-Semitism" and "Present Trends and Prospects". The final chapter, "The Christian Answer", admirable as it is in spirit, does not go very far towards ending the deadlock which the problem seems to have reached today. History and theology between them have left a heritage of division for which the blame is not entirely on either side; and the present embitterment of the question internationally has added immediately to the difficulties. But as a discussion of the whole matter the book attains a high level: it is balanced in its judgment, and is a fair and informed statement of what seems an insoluble problem. The book will be helpful to the general reader in forming his own estimate of the points at issue; and it is only in a spirit of forbearance on both sides, such as the authors manifest, that any lasting solution can be found.

The Fruits of the Spirit by Miss Evelyn Underhill (Longmans, 3s. 6d., paper covers, 72 pp.) contains five addresses delivered in 1936 at the House of Retreat, Pleshey. These are now published posthumously at the request of many friends. Miss Underhill was one of the most helpful of spiritual teachers and guides at gatherings of this kind, and there are very many who will be glad to have these addresses. They are marked by that clear-

ness of thought and spiritual fervour which marked all Miss Underhill's work. The latter part of the book contains letters which Miss Underhill wrote to a Prayer Group which she founded in 1939.

Dr. W. Osborne Greenwood's *Christianity and the Mechanists* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 9s.) is a survey of recent science with the object of showing that the mechanist theory of the universe and of man does not hold good; and that the Christian interpretation of life is sound, and is consistent with the facts of science. The book is intended for the general reader. Dr. Greenwood pays chief attention to biology because, he says, it is the biologist who is for the most part the "mechanist". The outline is well done, especially in the subjects which Dr. Greenwood knows best; but it is not certain that the physicist is as free from the doctrines of mechanism as this book implies. Still, it is on biology he lays the stress, and there is throughout a desire to be fair, and to avoid overstatement on either side. Thus there is a frank treatment of difficulties at the same time as a firm statement of belief in the Christian position. Dr. Greenwood has written a useful book.

Father Vincent McNabb's *Some Mysteries of Jesus Christ* (Burns, Oates, 2s. 6d.) contains many characteristic touches of the author's insight into the things that belong to faith. Some of the chapters seem to be notes from old sermons; others are like snatches of spiritual understanding. But there is wisdom running through this book; a wisdom that has grown from long contemplation of the mystery of the Incarnation.

Dr. Henry W. Clark has gathered together some new and some old poems in his *Collected Poems* (Williams & Norgate, 5s.). They make a volume which will give pleasure, and this is one of the sure evidences of good poetry. Dr. Clark has included two longer poems in the book, one on "Cranmer", the other on "Pilate". These are interesting character studies, but the metres tend rather to heaviness and sameness. It is in the shorter poems and in occasional lyrical pieces that Dr. Clark is at his best; in some of these he has an easy mastery over the music of language. In many of the poems there is a meditative vein which seldom becomes sentimental, but is clear and strong and health-giving. Dr. Clark speaks of this volume as likely to be "a final offering": his friends and many others will hope that this is not by any means the case.

Mr. Jack Gilbey's *Haven* (Burns, Oates, 3s. 6d.) is a small volume of poems which breathe a spirit of faith and tranquillity. They are simple, and without ornament, but they have a graciousness which will make them a help to many in these hard days. The book is beautifully printed. There is an introductory note by Cardinal Hinsley, and a frontispiece of the author.

Dr. John Macbeath's *Lilies among the Wheat* (Pickering, 3s. 6d.) is a volume of addresses to children. Some of us never find these easy to do. Dr. Macbeath's are very well done. They will be of use to teachers, and I feel sure to many ministers as well.

A. T. S. James.

Biblical students will be extremely grateful to Dr. C. H. Irwin and the Revs. A. D. Adams and S. A. Waters for their new and revised edition of *Cruden's Complete Concordance to the Old and New Testaments* (Lutterworth Press, 10s. 6d.). It contains upwards of 225,000 references, which are to the Authorized Version, attention being called by an asterisk where the Revised Version, and by a dagger where the American Revision, has altered the sense or made the meaning clearer. Proper names (except for

some seldom mentioned in Scripture, which are relegated to an appendix) are grouped with the general concordance under one alphabetical arrangement. The explanatory notes embody the latest Scriptural interpretations and the results of the most recent archæological discoveries. The work has 783 pages and is a trifle heavy to handle; the print is necessarily small but is clear.

In the English Association's collection of *Essays and Studies* (vol. 26; 1940; Clarendon Press, 7s. 6d.) Mr. W. R. Rutland shows how Tennyson's mind was saturated with the idea of evolution, and how current embryology as well as astronomy influenced his poetry; Mrs. Arundell Esdaile writes racily of Thomas Amory, the creator, where not the original, of *John Buncle;* Miss D. M. Stuart's subject is "Landscape in Augustan Verse", used "mainly as a backcloth", Collins alone spanning "the otherwise impassable gulf separating Milton from Wordsworth". More technical are Mrs. E. M. Simpson's study of the light thrown by the Dobell MS. at Harvard on the text of Donne's *Divine Poems,* and Mr. H. C. Wyld's consideration of "Style and Idiom in Fifteenth Century England". Mr. H. Macdonald comments on "Some Poetical Miscellanies, 1672-1716."

Mr. Hesketh Pearson's *Life of Shakespeare* (Penguin, 6d.) has the advantage that "For me his works alone would have made life worth living; so I am writing about something I love as much as life"; "he has been the most stimulating and exalting influence in my life". This is sufficient to ensure a fresh, because personal, approach to an old theme.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

Dr. A. D. Belden's *Pax Christi: The Peace of Christ* (Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d.) presents a scheme for converting into a wide-scale abandonment of war the conviction that active love, involving non-violence, is the only right way for the disciples of Christ to take. He urges that in all the capital cities of the world signatures should be collected of persons willing to promise that, whensoever "the Church" gives the word, they will thenceforward refuse all participation in war. Such a scheme cannot but command the sympathy and interest of all Christian pacifists and even of non-pacifist peace-lovers, like Mr. Hugh Redwood, who writes a foreword to the book; but many readers are likely to feel that the problem has been considerably over-simplified.

C. J. CADOUX.

The Poetry of Matthew Arnold, a Commentary, by Messrs. C. B. Tinker and H. F. Lowry (Oxford Press, 12s. 6d.), is of wider interest than appears at a first glance. The authors have made a minute study of Matthew Arnold's poetry. They indicate the various editions, readings and sources of all the poems, and offer discriminating comments. It is interesting to find that Arnold was his own good critic; in 1853 he wrote to Clough:

> I am glad you like the Gipsy Scholar—but what does it *do* for you? Homer *animates*—Shakespeare *animates*—in its poor way I think Sohrab and Rustum *animates*—the Gipsy Scholar at best awakens a pleasing melancholy. But this is not what we want.
>
> The complaining millions of men
> Darken in labour and pain—
>
> what they want is something to *animate* and *ennoble* them—not merely to add zest to their melancholy or grace their dreams.

The wider interest of the book lies in the insight it affords into the way a poet uses his materials and labours at his script. Sir Francis Wylie contributes an Appendix on The Scholar-Gipsy Country. He is admirable but

much less convincing about the famous elm than is A. D. Godley, whose essay on the subject is overlooked. N. MICKLEM.

In the preface to his book, *The Social Gospel Re-examined* (Clarke, 8s. 6d.), which contains the Rauschenbusch Lectures for 1939, Mr. F. Ernest Johnson declares:

> The purpose of the lectures has been to consider the net result of the impact of recent theological changes upon what has been known in America as the Social Gospel; to offer suggestions for a restatement of the general position which has gone by that name; and to clarify some of the major ethical problems of our time.

Though the first three chapters ("Introduction": "The Uses of Theology": "The Nature of Christian Ethic") promise well in fulfilment of these aims, the book falls away in the ensuing chapters of practical application. The value of the book for readers this side the Atlantic is further curtailed as the lectures were intended to be "relevant to the contemporary situation (1939) in America"; chapters on Christianity and War and Democracy and the Christian Ethic lose a good deal of their "bite" because of all that has happened since that time.

A publisher's "blurb" is not always the best guide to the contents of a book. Here is the exception. A pamphlet enclosed in *Community in a Changing World* (Community Service Committee: Chancton, Dartnell Park, West Byfleet, 3s. 6d.) indicates the theme of the symposium by saying "that it sets out to show not only what community in action *is* but what it *means* and how and why it is happening". It contends further that this book can be commended "as a text-book for students of social experiment; as a subject for discussion circles and as a story of some of the most interesting adventures of faith and service in our time". Close reading verifies these claims, and the book can be heartily commended.

What is Christian Education? by Miss Marjorie Reeves and Mr. John Drewett (C.N-L.: S.P.C.K., 1s. 6d.), is a compact report of "a piece of group thinking" on the question raised in the title. The answer is provided in the form of a concise and practical essay on the theory and technique of Christian Education, which deserves the attention of all those who are interested in this important subject.

Adult Schools, by Ernest Champness (The Religious Education Press, 1s. 6d.), is a concise account of the history and activities of a movement which well deserves the renewal of interest for which a strong plea is made in the closing pages. On p. 68 a whole line has strayed in from an alien source. S. MYERS.

The short story is, and will increasingly be to our time, what the drama was to the Elizabethans or the novel to the nineteenth century. This, briefly, is Mr. H. E. Bates's thesis in *The Modern Short Story* (Nelson, 7s. 6d.). It is an important book, and should help to eradicate the all too common prejudice against short stories as mere chips from the novelist's workshop. Mr. Bates traces the main lines of development from Gogol and Poe to the present day. His taste is catholic, as is shown by his selecting (amongst others) as "prime examples of that balanced perfection in the short story which gives the reader the incomparable feeling of being slightly lifted off the earth" certain Biblical stories as *Jonah,* Tchehov's *The Beauties,* Bierce's *A Horseman in the Sky,* and Joyce's *The Dead.* English readers, thanks to the genius of Constance Garnett, have long been familiar with the great Russian writers, but this book will give many for

the first time a real perspective of the equally important, if not equally distinguished, American short story.

Synge died young, and his output was very small. But he wrote two masterpieces—*Riders to the Sea* and *The Playboy of the Western World*, and will, besides, always be remembered for his influence on Yeats and the Irish literary renaissance. Mr. L. A. G. Strong in *John Millington Synge* (Allen & Unwin, 2s.), after the barest sketch of Synge's life, briefly analyses, with quotations, his poems, notebooks and plays. He is, perhaps, most illuminating on the poems.

Professor Hsiao Chi'en's *Etching of a Tormented Age* (Allen & Unwin, 2s.) is a brief survey of Chinese literature since the Republic, with a most interesting chapter on translations. This inspiring little sketch ends with a timely plea for the study in England of modern Chinese literature. For how can we hope to understand this new China if we stop at the T'ang poets, who died before Alfred the Great burned his cakes?

A third P.E.N. Book is Miss Phyllis Bentley's *The English Regional Novel* (Allen & Unwin, 2s.), which "occupies in fiction the place of the Dutch school of painters in art". *Shirley* (1849) is the first Regional novel, and the four great exponents of the form are Charlotte Brontë, George Eliot, Thomas Hardy, and Arnold Bennett. It should be noted that the essay is confined to the Regional novel of *England*.

"Most of the great English poets and prose writers have been fairly good walkers", says Mr. Hugh Macdonald in introducing his anthology, *On Foot* (Oxford Press, 4s. 6d.). A virtue of this book is its size—6 ins. by 3½ ins.—which fits comfortably into an ordinary pocket. Mr. Macdonald has cast his net widely, and included poetry and prose, history and fiction, walking in town and walking in the country. The extracts run from the *Book of Job* to the recently published *Kilvert's Diary*. Boswell and Johnson make their inevitable appearance, but the vast wealth of Highland walking literature is otherwise hardly touched upon. Most, but not all, of the extracts are dated.

English Domestic Life (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) is an anthology chosen by Mr. L. A. G. Strong from the novelists of the last 200 years, including a number of contemporaries. Since the novelists only are drawn upon, a method which excludes Walpole and Boswell, comparatively little space is given to the eighteenth century. It is amusing to learn that 130 years ago five hundred a year could be considered an excessive income for four upper class people: "Only conceive how comfortable they will be! . . . I am sure I cannot imagine how they will spend half of it".

In *Vanished Waters* (Methuen, 12s. 6d.) Mr. Alasdair Alpin MacGregor gives a charming account of his childhood in the remote settlement of Applecross on the seaboard of Wester Ross. His father, Colonel MacGregor, a famous traveller and formidable disciplinarian, is the real "hero" of the book. This is a sequel to *The Goat-Wife*, and a third and final volume of family biography is promised. There are photographs by the author, including a particularly fine one of the river and the Great Glen from the Castle of Inverness.

For tree-lovers, Mr. John Rodgers's *The English Woodland* (Batsford, 10s. 6d.) must be considered worth buying for the sake of its illustrations alone. This does not imply that the text is in any way subsidiary. In a pleasant and unpretentious style Mr. Rodgers describes briefly all the main surviving forests of England, giving, where possible, an historical sketch of each. In outline he covers the ground from Roman times to the activities

of the Forestry Commission and the great ice-storm of 1940. Particularly valuable is his account of Forest Law, and analysis of the technical terms associated with it—information not easily come by elsewhere. It is odd to find no mention of Charlotte Mew, who, though a Londoner all her life, sympathized with trees as living beings more intensely, perhaps, than any of our poets.

Mr. Janko Lavrin's *An Introduction to the Russian Novel* (Methuen, 7s. 6d.) deals as fully with the social and cultural background of the novel as with its literary quality, from Pushkin to the present day. The chapters on Turgenev, Dostoevsky, and Tolstoy are admirable. Perhaps inevitably the account of post-revolution writers reads too much like a catalogue. It is at least clear that Soviet literature has so far produced no figure remotely rivalling the great novelists of the nineteenth century.

Fine illustration is a *sine qua non* of Batsford books. But the depth of learning and grace of allusion in the text of Mr. John Russell's *Shakespeare's Country* (Batsford, 10s. 6d.) are unexpected, and make this a notable volume in a notable series.

Mr. Simon Harcourt-Smith's *The Last of Uptake* (Batsford, 15s.), enchantingly illustrated by Mr. Rex Whistler, is a study in baroque, a fantasy woven round a great Palladian mansion and its eccentric inhabitants. This beautiful and satisfying work, whose quality can as little be described as the bouquet of a rare wine, is a collector's piece, despite its modest price.

Mr. Stephen Spender's *Life and the Poet* (Secker & Warburg, 2s.) is a reasoned, wide-ranging, and, at moments, impassioned warning to contemporary poets to remember that it is life, not politics, that matters to the artist. It is cheering to discover that not all the poets of today are as contemptuous of tradition as they sometimes appear to be.

P. A. SPALDING.

Though a considerable proportion of Messrs. S. R. Humby and E. J. F. James's *Science and Education* (Cambridge Press, 3s. 6d.) is concerned with the technical problems of scientific education in schools, there is much in it that is of general interest. The authors are anxious that at all stages science teaching shall be kept in close touch with man and human life and given historical and philosophic background. They nowhere, however, consider a possible conflict in the pupil's mind between the scientific approach and the religious.

In Mr. Donald Hughes's *The Public Schools and the Future* (Cambridge Press, 3s. 6d.) is much that is sound; but though the author appreciates the Public schools "for what they may be than for what they are", he tends to look at educational problems very much from within the Public School tradition, however ardently he may wish to see that tradition in certain respects modified. He does not perceive that "the reasons why more than ever Englishmen are anxious to send their sons to Public Schools" are in the first place social rather than educational. Once, however, the immaturity and lack of breadth of the writer's experience have been allowed for, there is much to value in his ideas.

W. R. NIBLETT.

ALSO RECEIVED.

C. M. CHAVASSE, D.D. *The Meaning of the Lessons and of the Psalms.* S.P.C.K. 6s.

A Christian Basis for the Post-War World. A Commentary on the Ten Peace Points. S.C.M. 2s. 6d. By ten writers, introduced by the Archbishop of Canterbury.

R. G. PEARSE. *The Bible and War.* Williams & Norgate. 5s.

Servants of God. Vol I. Second ed., rev. By E. H. HAYES and L. E. COX. Vol. II. *Jesus and the Kingdom.* By E. H. HAYES. Junior Lessons on the Agreed Syllabuses. Religious Education Press. 4s. & 3s. 6d.

J. M. MACDOUGALL FERGUSON. *The Loveliest Friend.* Second ed., rev. Religious Education Press. 2s. 6d.

J. R. ECCLES. *Building a New Britain.* Author, The Elms, Lower Darwen, Lancs. 6d.

R. S. W. POLLARD. *You and the Call-Up.* Blandford Press. 1s.

"ALLAN JUNIOR". *St. Paul's Golden Thoughts about Love. Golden Thoughts about Friendship. Little Comments on Great Texts. In God's Care. Pearls of Thought from Omar Khayyám. Helpful Hymns. "Atlantic Charter".* Valentine. 3d. each. All but the last are "Golden Thoughts" booklets.

LECTURES, PAMPHLETS, *ETC.*

PROF. R. H. Tawney's Raleigh Lecture was on *Harrington's Interpretation of His Age* (Oxford Press, 2s.), Dr. Edward Thompson's Conway Lecture on *Ethical Ideals in India Today* (Watts, 1s.), and the Bishop of Hong-Kong's Hale Sermon on *New Church Order: The Future of the World-Wide Episcopal Church* (Seabury-Western Seminary, Evanston, Ill.). All three are well worth reading. Dr. William Paton edits *Religion and Life* (King, 2s.), addresses at the St. Albans "Religion and Life" Week (the caricatures might have been omitted) and writes No. 5 of "World Issues", *Continental Christianity in War-time* (Edinburgh House, 3d.). Mr. C. C. Salway's *Refugees and Industry* (Williams & Norgate, 1s.) shows the contribution refugees in Britain are making. Mr. R. Wilson Black's *Account Rendered* (U.K.A.) is a reply to the Brewers, and the Rev. Bryan H. Reed's *A Church Clubland in Action* (Epworth Press, 4d.) a vigorous and constructive attack on the Youth problem. Broadcast talks are the Archbishop of Canterbury's *Palm Sunday to Easter* (S.C.M., 1s. 6d.) and Canon Cockin's *Religion and the Modern Mood* (S.C.M., 9d.): Canon Cockin just doesn't get there; he says to ordinary folk over the "mike": "Think of Mr. T. S. Eliot's *The Waste Land* as a picture of one aspect of ordinary life"! Does any ordinary man understand *The Waste Land*? Does Canon Cockin? Then we have Mr. G. M. Gathorne-Hardy's useful *Norway and the War* (Oxford Press, 4d.), *Songs and Lyrics of Sir Walter Scott* (Oliver & Boyd, 3s. 6d.), and Mr. R. H. Markham's *The Wave of the Past* (Oxford Press, 2s.).

A. P.

In *Dr. Whale and Infant Baptism* (Berean Press), which has been written at the request of the Publishing Committee of the Churches of Christ, the Rev. James Gray argues that "in his statement on Baptism" in *Christian Doctrine* Dr. J. S. Whale "is untrue to the Christianity of the New Testament and inconsistent with his own statement of Christian doctrine". *Jehovah's Witnesses,* by the Rev. J. M. Swift (Mowbray, 4d.), is a useful account of the history, teaching, and methods of a movement sufficiently powerful for a convention of nearly 10,000 of its adherents to be held at Leicester last September. Mr. Alex. Comfort has written a miracle play, *Into Egypt* (Grey Walls Press, 1s.), in which the poignancy of present-day refugees from Nazi persecution is expressed with an eye to *Matthew* 2: no production rights are claimed. Mr. J. M. Macdougall Ferguson has written *Look upon a Little Child: A Child's First Prayer Book* and *Hear My Prayer: The Junior's Own Prayer Book* (Religious Education Press, 6d. each), which will both be found helpful. Mr. R. J. Seal's *School Services and Prayers* is published by the Lutterworth Press (6d.). Among the publications of the Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions are the Rev. A. T. Houghton's *The Battle of World Evangelisation*

(4d.), Mr. Roland Hogben's *The Criterion of Truth*, Mr. H. A. Evan Hopkins's *Did Christ Die In Vain?* (2d. each); and the Rev. G. T. Manley's *The Revelation of St. John: Some Notes on its Interpretation* (3d.). Mr. James Scott's *Has God a Purpose in this War?* (author, 18 Church Road, Giffnock, Glasgow, 4d.) is published in conjunction with the Scottish Prophetical Council. The first four of a series of leaflets published by the Youth Committee of the Congregational Union of Scotland (the Rev. J. B. Wilson, 28 Cairndow Avenue, Glasgow, S.4, 1s. 3d. for 50) are entitled *The Shape of Things to Come, New Men for the New World, The Power that Makes New Men*, and *Personality: Nazi and Christian*. The World Dominion Press is publishing a useful "War-Time Survey Series", of which the first three, all by the Rev. Alexander McLeish (9d. each) are *A Racial Melting Pot: Religion in Malaya, A Christian Archipelago: Religion in the Philippines*, and *To-Day in Thailand (Siam)*. Nos. 41-44 of the Eagle Books (Livingstone Press, 3d. each) are *Doctor Apricot: Duncan Main of China*, by Mr. P. J. Doherty, *She Went Alone: Mary Bird of Persia*, by Mr. C. Savery, *Tomahawk Truce: William Penn*, by Mr. M. R. Bielby, and *Rough, Tough and Far Away: James Edgar of Tibet*, by Mr. A. G. Castleton. The Oxford Pamphlets on World Affairs continue their high standard of succinct lucidity. The most recent are *China*, by Prof. P. M. Roxby, *Great Britain and China* and *Japan and the Modern World*, both by Sir John Pratt, *Belgium and the War*, by Prof. G. N. Clark, *Greece*, by Lt.-Col. Stanley Casson (specially brilliant), *Who Mussolini Is*, by Mr. Ivor Thomas, and *War at Sea To-day*, by Admiral Sir Herbert Richmond.

G. F. N.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

The London Quarterly and Holborn (April). Dr. George Jackson has a fascinating article on R. W. Dale. Among other contributors are Dr. C. Ryder Smith ("The Bible and Preaching"), Dr. A. E Garvie ("The Christ, The Kingdom and the Church"), Mr. Duncan Coomer ("Aspects of Holy Communion"), and Mr. E. Gordon Rupp ("The Recantation of Thomas Bilney"). An interesting and well-balanced issue.

The Hibbert Journal (April). Among the eleven articles are Professor W. G. de Burgh's "Intelligence in Quest of Faith", Dr. Robert Eisler's "Vanity of Vanities: the book 'Ecclesiastes' restored to the original form", Mr. Hugh Ross Williamson's "The Necessity of Resurrection", the Rev. R. A. Edwards' "The Evidence for the Resurrection", Dr. John Murphy's "How we are Limited by Language in Philosophy and Theology", and Mr. Lewis Spence's "The Supernatural Character of Robin Hood". Dr. S. H. Mellone surveys recent philosophical and theological literature.

The Layman (April) contains accounts of the Baptist laymen's effort to raise 15,000 guineas and of the effect of the war on West Midland Churches. The Rev. Herbert Anderson continues his survey of the effect of modern missions on the life of India, and the Rev. W. E. Booth Taylor writes on "Sanctify The Organization!"

The Modern Churchman (Feb.-May). The change in the Primacy receives full comment in "Signs of the Times". Among the articles are Sir Cyril Norwood's "Religious Education", the Editor's "Scriptural Authority and Ecclesiastical Authority", and the Rev. Ronald Preston's review of "The Malvern Conference".

The Expository Times (Mar.-May). Dr. W. F. Lofthouse examines "The Cry of Dereliction", Dr. J. W. Jack surveys "Recent Biblical Archæology", Dr. B. A. Yeaxlee considers "Common Ground concerning Religious Education" and "Adult Education in Religion", the Rev. J. Wood asks "Is the Old Testament Christian Scripture?", Professor T. W. Manson contributes to "Is it possible to write a Life of Christ?", the Rev. J. T. Hudson points to "The Aramaic Basis of St. Mark: I. Grammatical".

The Friends' Quarterly Examiner (First & Fourth Quarters). Arthur Rowntree concludes his recollections, which are to be reprinted, there are many participants in a discussion of the future of Friends' Schools, and accounts of Henry M. Wallis.

The Evangelical Quarterly (Jan.). Dr. D. M. Lloyd-Jones discusses the relation between "Religion and Morality", the Rev. T. F. Torrance inquires into "The Place and Function of Reason in Christian Theology", Prof. O. A. Piper contributes to "The Understanding of the Synoptic Parables", Dr. J. T. Hornsby defends "The Sacramental Principle". (April). Mr. E. K. Simpson writes on "The Apostle John's Diction", observing the chiasmus common to the Fourth Gospel, the Epistles of John, and the Revelation; the Rev. J. Warren asks "Is Sanctification a Gradual Process?" and decides not; Dr. A. Mitchell Hunter studies "Geneva—the Cradle of Calvinism"; Dr. John Macleod interprets "The Sure Mercies of David".

Religion in Education (April). Professor L. W. Grensted writes of "God: 1. the Father", the Rev. John Foster discusses the teaching of "Church History in School", Mr. M. L. Jacks asks "What is Christian Education?".

The International Review of Missions (April). A large number of articles, mostly short, with reference to Mexico, Japan, Thailand, India, and Africa. Dr. D. S. Cairns writes on "Victory in this World", and the Rev. E. A. Payne on "Carey's 'Enquiry': An Essay for the Ter-Jubilee".

World Dominion (March-June). China is in the front of the picture, with a vivid story of an evening with the Chiang Kai-sheks and an account of the Burma Road. But few lands go unmentioned, and Dr. Cochrane's "Countries in the News" is very useful.

The Harvard Theological Review (Jan.). "A Tarsian Peculiarity (Dio Prus. Or. 33)", by Campbell Bonner; "The Ending of St. Mark's Gospel", by Wilfrid Lawrence Knox; "Jewish Religious Influences in the Adler Papyri", by V. Tscherikower and F. M. Heichelheim; "Myths and Ritual: a General Theory", by Clyde Kluckhohn.

The Review of Religion (Jan.). Ananda K. Coomaraswamy writes on "Eastern Religions and Western Thought", in reference to Sir S. Radhakrishnan's volume thus entitled, Joseph L. Blau sketches "The Diffusion of the Christian Interpretation of the Cabala in English Literature" ("the highest point . . . during the seventeenth century", though "Milton was not a Cabalist"), Clarence A. Manning considers "Khomyakov and the Orthodox Church".

The Review of Religion (March). Henry R. Zimmer discusses "The Hindu View of World History According to the Puranas" (illustrated), Moses Hadas writes on "The Religion of Plutarch", Alban G. Widgery relates "Christianity and the Particularities of History", Abraham Heschel offers "An Analysis of Piety".

The Review and Expositor (Jan.). The two main articles are "Dryden's Quest for Authority in Religion", by Gerald Giles Grubb, and "Some Survivals of Spirit Worship and Allied Beliefs in Modern China", by George A. Carver.

Anglican Theological Review (Jan.). A. T. Olmstead writes on "The Chronology of Jesus' Life" (he would date Jesus' birth about 20 B.C.), the Assistant Bishop of Hong-Kong on "The Faith of the Chinese Church in Action To-day", Bayard H. Jones on "Marriage and Divorce", Herbert Pierrepont Morgan "On The Immortality of the Soul".

Theological Studies (Feb.). Fr. J. J. Clifford discusses "The Ethics of Conjugal Intimacy according to St. Albert the Great", Fr. J. H. Taylor "St. Cyprian and the Reconciliation of Apostates"; three articles are continuations, among these being Fr. L. J. McGinley's criticism of *Formgeschichte.*

Religion and Life (Summer). A dazzling list of contributors, including Dr. J. R. Sizoo, Dr. Edwin Lewis ("Revelation and Its Alternative"), Dr. Lynn H. Hough ("The Christian in Peace and War"), Dr. J. A. Kelso ("The Old Testament after Half a Century"), and Dr. A. S. Tuttle ("Modern Substitutes in Religion").

The Yale Review (Spring). The entry of America into the war is reflected in a large number of articles. Prof. Carl Becker opens with "Making Democracy Safe in the World"; Mr. George Vernadsky reviews Russian policy, Mr. F. Y. Yang writes on "Resistance and Reconstruction in China", Sir Robert Holland gives "A British View of India's Problems"; Miss Bettina Linn describes "The Fortunate Generation", the young discoverers of Joyce and Proust and Lawrence and Virginia Woolf.

In Extremis (Dec.). One can well believe that the Christian attitude to the Old Testament is a live question in Switzerland at the moment: Pfr. Werner Bieder upholds *Die Herrlichkeit u. Unentbehrlichkeit des A.T.*, M. Jacques de Senarclens inquires into *L'interpretation de l'A.T.*

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE UNION OF MODERN FREE CHURCHMEN.

To the Editor.

SIR,

In your April Editorial Notes the acting Editor, Dr. Selbie,

> finds it difficult to justify the existence of an organization like the Modern Free Churchmen's Union. . . . Such organizations, societies, unions or whatever they are called are bound to be divisive and disruptive. They encourage propaganda and proselytizing. They become one-sided and tend to over emphasize non-essentials. Congregationalism at any rate has no use for this kind of thing.

This criticism calls for some reply:

(1) It is not denied that the ideal itself is worthy. In the previous issue of the *Congregational Quarterly* Dr. Selbie himself expressed our attitude admirably:

> The eyes of the Churches are too often on the past rather than on the present or future. To imagine as some seem to do that the present crisis can be met by a return to medievalism in dogma and worship is an ostrich policy which can only defeat its own ends. What is needed now is a courage born of experience and rooted in conviction, a faith in the living spirit of God who leads men into all the truth, and a gospel tested in experience and proclaimed in the living language of today.

If the recognition of this truth is so necessary for the welfare of the Church, why should the existence of a group of earnest men standing for this emphasis be considered deplorable?

(2) We feel that all the arguments that are brought to support the conception of a Church, the need of fellowship, distinctive and open witness, collective strength, co-operative labour, hold good for such an organization as ours. There is special need of fellowship. There are many isolated and lonely people who find no sympathy, understanding and comradeship in so many of our churches, and indeed are often made to feel that they are outside the pale of Christian fellowship. Our Union offers that fellowship and claims its place within the larger Church.

(3) We have at the moment the challenge of a theological reaction. Barthianism which at nearly every point is inconsistent with and antagonistic towards all liberal religious thought has received an amazing amount of favour in recent years. Again it has become fashionable in influential circles of English Nonconformity to exalt "classical theology", insist on "dogma", decry liberalism, and doubt the possibility of Christian humanism. In the expression of our opposite views we have nothing like the opportunities of platform, pulpit, press, lecture room and wireless open to those who represent the more conservative tradition. Our Union does, however, provide some modest means of stating our case and bearing what we feel is essentially a Reformation and Puritan witness. We have our

"gospel" and we feel that necessity is laid upon us—yea, woe is unto us if we do not preach it.

(4) Organization is not necessarily divisive and disruptive. Some of us feel that Modernism, stressing unifying scholarship and the fundamental spiritual experiences underlying the secondary traditionalist forms, is working towards a new Catholicity to be attained without the weaknesses of ambiguity and compromise. But even if the bearing of our witness should unhappily have the results Dr. Selbie fears, we should only lie under the same charge which could be brought against the first Christians, the Reformers, the Puritans, the Separatists, the prophets whose tombs we garnish. We are warned against the dangers of propaganda and proselytizing—since when was this a religious crime? Do we not regard it as highly commendable to organize missions at home and abroad to declare what we feel to be true and to win others to our point of view?

(5) Dr. Selbie suggests that the organization of liberalism is superfluous in so freedom-loving a denomination as Congregationalism. One would have thought that such a denomination would have welcomed a group of men stressing its distinctive principle and exercising that vigilance which is the price of its preservation. Or looking at the matter from another angle, why in so free a denomination should the claim to form such a union as ours be so found to offend? But more than this—our Union is not for Congregationalists alone—it is the Union of Modern Free Churchmen.

(6) We can hardly regret the services to the religious life of the nation rendered by the conferences and publications of the Anglican Modern Churchmen's Union, supported by such influential men as Norwood, Inge, Matthews, Raven, and Major. Anyone who knows intimately the present life and outlook of the Free Churches can hardly say that while there is need of a Modern Churchmen's Union in Anglicanism, there is no such need among the Free Churches!

(7) Whether our Union of Modern Free Churchmen exercises a parallel salutary influence on our Free Church *ethos* depends largely on the spiritual and intellectual quality of the men who associate themselves with it. If we have the sympathy, support, and guidance of Free Church leaders with personal liberal sympathies, it can be made a force for righteousness and for the strengthening and exaltation of the Christian Church. If denied this help it may not escape the weaknesses to which the editorial note refers. It will become what we make it. The shaping of its message is in the hands of those who boldly identify themselves with it. It is personnel which will count. We who have tried to stand for its highest ideals have the encouragement contained in a letter from the late Dr. Vernon Bartlet written shortly before his death:

> The positive rather than the negative note prevailing in your Modern Free Churchman's Bulletin is a great satisfaction to me and confirms my already growing hopes that the Union will increasingly deliver its testimony in a spirit of Christian love. . . . Go on in this spirit and the Union of Modern Free Churchmen will do a great and needful work in its day and generation alongside its Anglican sister of like name.

Yours truly,

H. Bulcock,

President of the Union of Modern Free Churchmen.

VARIA.

Sir,

I represent the feelings of many readers when I welcome you home and when I anticipate *Journal 1942*.

Suffer a few matters that are on my mind.

(1) Like yourself I found and find much joy in Mr. Sampson's *Concise Cambridge History of English Literature;* but he hasn't much to say about us, and refers readers "desiring details about the literature of Dissent" to the larger History. Most of his kind words are reserved for the Quakers, who get a full chapter. But when he says they were attacked by Bunyan and Baxter he forgets that the Quakers began the attack and that in their early years they were not what they afterwards became. He denies (p. 554) the claim of the Free Churches to have asserted the principles of religious toleration, apparently unmindful or ignorant of Helwys, Busher, and Roger Williams, and assigns to Dissent under the Commonwealth the ugly persecution of the Quakers, ignoring their far wider and intenser sufferings under the Clarendon Code. And while acknowledging the debt of the 18th century to Dissent "for its wholesome educational zeal" he is hardly accurate in saying that the academies "gradually dwindled into decay"—they were the root of our present Theological Colleges and of some of our University Colleges.

(2) The testimony of Dewan Bahadur S. E. Runganadhan from the chair of the L.M.S. public meeting to the effect that the fundamentals of Congregationalism in which he had been intensively nurtured are still in his belief "the right principles for the Indian Church", should give pause to the officials of the Society, who with others are harping strongly on the Union Movement in South India. Anything further removed from the simplicity that is in Christ than the proposed elaborate scheme would be difficult to find unless it be the similar one (based on it) put forward for home consumption. It would be well for us all to read and ponder a book called *Rethinking Christianity in India,* the work of a group of Indian Christian graduates, including teachers and lawyers, prepared for the Tambaram Conference (Hogarth Press, Madras, 2½ rupees). Its peculiar strength lies in its advocacy of making Christianity an indigenous movement, relating it to the great Indian religious heritage and giving it an Indian expression in life, thought, and activity. I believe it is such a book as Bernard Lucas and Edward Rice would have approved—and they knew their India.

(3) I had occasion recently to look up the 1863 *Year Book*. It has an obituary notice of James Bennett, one of my predecessors at Romsey and as a college teacher and Chairman of the Union. "He was almost the last of the generation of worthies of the Independent Nonconformists". Sir, they are an unconscionably long time in dying!

Yours sincerely,

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

Lancashire College.
30th May, 1942.

P.S.—"The day of small nations has passed away; the day of Empires has come".

No—not Adolf. Joe (not Stalin but Chamberlain), at Birmingham on the 13th May, 1904.

WORTH NOTING FROM RECENT BOOKS.

THE unmistakable trend, of late, is back to traditional theology. The grazing lands of liberalism which seemed so green during peace and prosperity are now felt to be too exposed for these times of confusion and terror. To many it seems that these attractive pastures have gradually become parched until they are now hardly distinguished from the waste lands of humanism. Hence easily enough have the fires of war and the storms of social injustice started a stampede into the bad lands of irrational mythology. This scramble for refuge, however, usually takes pains to dignify itself by assuming the name of a return to theology.

Not so long ago, humanism became considered by increasing numbers a state of religious emancipation. The humanist was held up as the pioneer who had made his way from the dusky lowlands of primitive mythology to the brighter heights of scientific discovery. Now, however, the humanist is being more and more accused of being a pied piper who piped the cocksure melody of a one-eyed method that lured many into the killing cold of scientific abstraction. Frozen there by human pride, they say, those who followed are now too numb to return to the satisfying climate of divine truth. Although deep in their hearts may be the wish to escape, how pleasant they find it just to sit in the snows of sophisticated self-satisfaction!

A return to theology! The theologian ought to look such a gift horse in the mouth. He must not be pulled out of focus by the glamour of humanism when it is fashionable; nor must he shrink from the name when men revile it.

Nels F. S. Ferré, *The Christian Faith.*

It is impossible to exaggerate the essential and paramount importance of the personal nature of all pastoral work. For there is the ever-present pitfall in the life of every priest in the Church of England of being betrayed into thinking more about organization and numbers than about individuals. It is a danger to be avoided at all costs; no one who has not been exposed to it knows how insistent it is. It often masquerades under the title of loyalty; we must be loyal to the diocese by attending conferences, and sitting on committees; we must be loyal to the deanery by taking part in any scheme which the rural dean launches. Such loyalty is admirable in its way, but it must never be allowed to interfere with the higher loyalty to One who bids us, "Feed My sheep; feed My lambs". Our supreme duty is to know each member of the flock, to love and to tend them, *one by one.*

Arthur W. Hopkinson, *Pastor's Progress.*